Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-87-242 *17 December 1987*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Karpov Interviewed on INF, Further Accords *[Mainz ZDF Television]* 1
Chervov Discusses Disarmament Prospects 1
'New Thinking' on Inspections Welcomed *[Savelyev in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 16 Dec]* 2
Kozyakov: Statements on SDI Cause 'Concern' 3
Nitze Addresses INF, START Issues 4
Plant To Switch From Missile-Related Output *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 15 Dec]* 4
U.S. Assembling CW Shells Despite 'Commitment' 5
Round of Chemical Weapons Talks Ends 5

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Medvedev, Dobrynin Receive Bloc Party Aides *[PRAVDA 16 Dec]* 6

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

U.S.-Israeli Memorandum At Variance With Trends 7
USSR Delegation Head on Agreement on CSCE Aims 7
Further on Violation of Japanese Airspace 7
PRAVDA Reviews Book on Current State of Capitalism *[A. Porokhovskiy in PRAVDA 1 Dec]* 8

REAGAN-GORBACHEV SUMMIT

'Achievements and Hopes' Program on Summit *[Levin, Primakov, Shishlin]* 10
Zalyghin Discusses Relations After Summit 14
Opinion Poll Conducted on Results of Summit 14
Comparison of Gorbachev 9 Dec Luncheon Speech 14
Inter-edition Comparison of Gorbachev Speech 15
Comparison of Gorbachev Embassy Dinner Speech 16
Comparison of Reagan USSR Embassy Dinner Speech 17
Comparison of Farewell Ceremony, Reagan Speech 17
Comparison of Gorbachev Farewell Speech 18
Comparison of Joint Summit Statement 19

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Bush: Ratification Necessary 'Without Delay' 21
IZVESTIYA on Americans' Reaction to Treaty *[16 Dec]* 21
Charikov on U.S. Reactions, Media Role 22
Korzin Hits Nitze Remarks on Military Balance 23
11 Dec U.S. Trident-2 Missile Test Reported 23
Further on Space Cooperation Protocol 24
Soviet, U.S. Academics Hold Roundtable 24
U.S., Israel Sign Military Cooperation Agreement 24
Shabayev on 'Sinister Meaning' 25
U.S. Journal Prints Gorbachev GOSR Speech 25
Moscow TV Attacks U.S. on Human Rights 25
Senate Approves Government Spending Bill 26
U.S. Minesweepers to Use Robots in Gulf 26

China

Beijing Commentator Discusses INF Treaty *[Beijing]* 26
U.S. Position Toward Xizang Criticized *[Shakov]* 27
U.S. Advisor Briefs PRC Officials on Summit 28
S&T Cooperative Agreements To Be Signed 28
Joint Fishery Cooperation Pact Signed 28
Talks Held on Medical Cooperation 28

Northeast Asia

Adamishin Briefs Japanese on INF Treaty 28
Takeshita Hails INF Accord 29
Japan's Fishing Talks Continue; Few Results 29
U.S. Pressures Japan on Cocom Restrictions 29
USSR-Japan Trade Association Session Begins *[PRAVDA 16 Dec]* 30
Reportage on ROK Presidential Election 30
U.S Neutrality Questioned *[Gosteb]* 30
U.S. Trying to Secure Presence 31
Moscow TV on Election *[V. Korzin]* 31
Ruling Party Candidate Leads 31

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Sihanouk Wants Further Talks With Hun Sen 32
Japanese Presence at ASEAN Forum Assessed *[V. Ovchinnikov in PRAVDA 16 Dec]* 32
Soviet-Vietnamese Economic Ties, Prospects Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 11 Dec]* 33
Satellite To Beam TV Programs to Australia *[PRAVDA 12 Dec]* 35

Near East & South Asia

CPSU Discusses Ties With Afghan Provinces *[PRAVDA 17 Dec]* 35
Shevardnadze Discusses DRA With UN's Cordovez 36
Moscow Optimistic on Afghan-Pakistani Talks 36
DRA's Najibullah Receives AUCCTU Delegation *[TRUD 16 Dec]* 37
Iraq's Husayn Receives Soviet Envoy Sutenko 37

East Europe

Envoy Sees 'No Problems' With INF Ratification *[TANJUG]* 37
Kosovo Official on Combating 'Separatism' *[IZVESTIYA 12 Dec]* 38
LCY's KOMUNIST Cited on Internal Problems *[PRAVDA 16 Dec]* 38
Trade Protocols Signed With GDR, Romania *[PRAVDA 12 Dec]* 38
Sorokin, Delegation Received by GDR's Kessler *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Dec]* 39
Mutual Supplies Protocol Signed With GDR *[ADN]* 39
BCP Visitors Study Agro-Industry Leadership *[PRAVDA 12 Dec]* 39
Chemical Venture Plan Concluded With Poland *[PRAVDA 12 Dec]* 39
Finland's Ahde, A. E. Voss Note INF Treaty *[IZVESTIYA 12 Dec]* 40

West Europe

Shultz Arrives in London; To Meet Thatcher, Howe 40
Soviets Brief Europeans on Summit Results 40
Consultations With Irish 40
Meeting With Swiss Official 40
Austria's Vranitzky Informed 40
Finnish President Briefed 41
Antonov, FRG's Bangemann on Economic Cooperation 41
Soviet-FRG Colloquium Opens in Salzgitter 41
Accords 'Impetus' to Cooperation 42
First Soviet-Franco-Italian Enterprise Set Up 42

CP of Peoples of Spain Delegation Visits USSR *[PRAVDA 12 Dec]* 43
Finnish Social Democrats Visit Soviet Union *[PRAVDA 13 Dec]* 43
Greece's Papandreou Interviewed on INF Summit 43
Soviet Envoy Utkin on Gorbachev NATO Remarks *[Ankara ANATOLIA]* 44

Latin America & Caribbean

Nicaragua's Ortega Announces Cease-Fire 44
U.S. To Deliver F-5 Fighters to Honduras 17 Dec 44
CPSU Greets Martiniquais CP Congress *[PRAVDA 12 Dec]* 45

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Public Dismay Over Yeltsin Affair Admitted *[AFP]* 46
Supreme Soviet Criticizes Electrical Ministry 46
Party Dismissals Reported in Volyn Obkom *[RADYANSKA UKRAINA 8 Dec]* 47
Vladimir Obkom Plenum Addresses Glasnost *[PRAVDA 12 Dec]* 47
Moscow Obkom Plenum Proceedings Reported *[PRAVDA 11 Dec]* 50
Kharkov Obkom Tackles Persisting Shortcomings
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 11 Dec] 52
First Day of AUCCTU Plenum Reported *[TRUD 12 Dec]* 54
Kiev Conference Tackles Nationality Problems *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 4 Dec]* 54
Georgian Premier Interviewed on Rail Crash *[PRAVDA 13 Dec]* 55
Independent Journalists Union Founded *[AFP]* 57
KOMMUNIST's 18th Issue Previewed *[PRAVDA 16 Dec]* 57
Veteran Argues Importance of Malaya Zemlya *[PRAVDA 23 Nov]* 58
New War History Will Fill 'Objective Need' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Dec]* 60
Book on Lenin's Guidance of Cheka Reviewed *[PRAVDA 9 Dec]* 62

Economic

First Business With Shareholders Reported *[AFP]* 64
Attitudes Hampering Economic Reform Scored *[PRAVDA 11 Dec]* 64
Stalin's Economic System Must Be Replaced *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 2 Dec]* 65
Briefs 67
Shipping Facility in Vladivostok 67

Agricultural

Ligachev Addresses Conference on 1988 Harvest *[PRAVDA 16 Dec]* 67

Scientific

'Raduga' Satellite Orbital Parameters Noted 68
'Unstable' Satellite Operation Reported 68
Academician Koptyug Clarifies PRAVDA Article *[PRAVDA 12 Dec]* 69

Military

Intellectuals Rapped Over 'Hostility' Toward Army *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Dec]* 69
Reservists' Rally Focuses on Patriotic Education *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Dec]* 72

Karpov Interviewed on INF, Further Accords

DW162145 Mainz ZDF Television Network in German 1915 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Interview with Viktor Karpov, Chief of the Arms Control and Disarmament Administration at the USSR Foreign Ministry, by reporter Dirk Sager; on the "Kennzeichen D" program; in English with superimposed German translation; no place and date given—recorded]

[Text] [Sager] Mr Karpov, the first step was made in Washington with the INF accord. The next one will deal with strategic nuclear weapons. What could that step mean for the Europeans?

[Karpov] First of all, it means a lot—not just for the Europeans, but for the whole world. As to the reduction of U.S. and Soviet nuclear weapons the first step only means a small percentage. The next step, however, the reduction of the strategic weapons by 50%, means very much—a halving of the strategic nuclear arsenal. Tensions, it is true, will not be reduced by double, but tensions will be reduced further. Thus we will have the opportunity to think about other potentials that should be reduced, too. I am talking in particular about conventional forces, and that is very significant for Europe. It means that we are ready to make a radical step toward reducing conventional forces. Some people ask what to do first. We say that first we should deal with asymmetries, with what is called the superior part of the Soviet forces.

[Sager] Many people expected such a step at the East Berlin summit. Why was it not made?

[Karpov] In fact, in June 1986 we suggested to talk about conventional forces. We are still waiting for an answer. A negotiation mandate for such negotiations is being prepared in Vienna now. We hope that it can be concluded, and that negotiations about the reduction of conventional forces in all of Europe can be started. Here, we could first of all deal with asymmetries and imbalance. As a matter of fact, the existing imbalance is not just favorable for the Soviet Union, but also for NATO. For instance, we have more tanks; NATO has more tactical aircraft. We should deal with these asymmetries. In addition, there are regional inequalities. In central Europe, it is true, we have more armed forces. However, if you consider the southern flank between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, you will find that NATO is stronger. We should discuss all those inequalities—the regional ones, and those concerning armed forces, so that for both sides situations allowing offensive operations must be excluded. We must achieve that only defensive operations are possible—on both sides.

[Sager] Would you think that—after what has happened in Washington—that is a realistic position?

[Karpov] Yes, I think so. We are talking about the future. We are confronted with the problem of what to do next. The reduction of strategic weapons by 50%, the reduction of conventional weapons, the ban and elimination of chemical weapons—those are the most significant subjects. We can deal with these problems and solve them.

[Sager] Could you imagine, in the near future, a Europe without foreign troops in foreign countries? Do you really support such an idea?

[Karpov] Yes, I would support such a vision. Realistically, however, I see no opportunity to get rid of foreign troops in the near future. Before we can do that, we have to prepare the ground for such a withdrawal. The reduction of conventional forces, the reduction of conventional weapons, and the elimination of tactical nuclear weapons would be a decisive support for that.

[Sager] Last question, Mr Karpov: So far, the security of the Warsaw Pact countries has been guaranteed by Soviet troops not just externally, but also internally, including internal political effects, and internal stability of the countries.

[Karpov] No, we do not think that the situation is like you descibe it. We think that many factors are responsible for political instability. One of the most important is the uncertainty regarding the relations between East and West. If we could improve those relations, build more confidence, more human relations, we would have a more stable European house, in which all people can live freely.

Chervov Discusses Disarmament Prospects

LD170938 Moscow TASS in English 0909 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 17 TASS—A TASS diplomatic correspondent reports:

Ratification of the Soviet-U.S. treaty signed in Washington and the implementation of all its provisions will make it possible to exclude such notions as intermediate- and shorter-range missiles from the military lexicon. Colonel-General Nikolay Chervov, head of a department of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union, said today in an interview with the TASS diplomatic correspondent.

"An important step along the road of nuclear-missile disarmament has been made. Time has come now actively to prepare for continuing headway towards a nuclear-free world. A 50 per cent cut in strategic offensive arms is on the agenda. The main thing in this respect is to observe the objectively existing inter-relationship between a reduction in strategic offensive arms and ABM limitation problems", General Chervov emphasised.

"With an eye to the preparation of a treaty on strategic offensive arms, the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States instructed their delegations in Geneva to work out an accord which would make it binding upon the sides to observe the ABM Treaty in the form in which it had been signed in 1972 in the process of research, development and, if necessary, tests, which are allowed under the ABM Treaty, and not to withdraw from it within an agreed period. The other major problems which rivet the attention of the world public now are to reduce conventional arms as well as to conclude a convention on the elimination of chemical weapons".

"At present representatives of the Warsaw Treaty organization and NATO in Vienna are discussing a mandate on future talks on reducing the armed forces, nuclear and conventional arms from the Atlantic to the Urals. There are certain hopes that such a mandate will have been worked out, if only in general outline, by December 18—the day of the completion of the Vienna meeting", talks on problems outlined in it may begin as early as in May 1988. Interested in this now are European countries and the Warsaw Treaty member-states. The Warsaw Treaty member-states, in particular, way back in June 1986, put forward specific proposals in Budapest on a reduction of the armed forces, tactical nuclear and conventional arms in Europe".

"This work is the embodiment of the socialist countries' policy of expediting solutions to disarmament issues in all fields: nuclear missiles, conventional, and chemical weapons—all types of weapons of mass destruction. One can say in this connection that these actions are a concrete realisation of the programme, put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev on January 15, 1986, for building a nuclear-free world".

General Chervov has pointed out there are now two problems standing in the way towards finalizing the elaboration of a convention banning chemical weapons: the U.S. Government's decision to start the production of binary weapons as well as the possibility of concealing industrial capacities for covert production of chemical weapons, resultant of taking private-owned commercial firms and transnational corporations out of control.

"On these problems we do not find points of contact with the Americans, and the stands of our two countries have not so far drawn closer together", he emphasised.

"The Soviet side demands that the entire industry capable of producing chemical weapons, and not only state-run ones, be placed under control. Private-owned commercial firms and transnational corporations account for more than 60 per cent of the U.S. industrial potential. Clearly visible in the United States' stand is a desire to gain unilateral advantages and to conceal its chemical potential. Such a stand hinders the conclusion of a convention to this effect".

"The issue was the subject of discussion at the meeting in Washington, which found reflection in the joint Soviet-U.S. summit statement which says, in particular, that the Soviet Union and the United States come out in favour of greater openness and more active confidence-building measures in the field of chemical weapons at both bilateral and multilateral basis. In this matter it is of importance to move on from words to deeds", General Chervov emphasised.

'New Thinking' on Inspections Welcomed

PM171115 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 16 Dec 87 p 3

[Interview with A.G. Savelyev, staffer at the USSR Academy of Sciences World Economics and International Relations Institute, by A. Novikov: "Everyone Has Gained"; date, place not specified; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The Soviet-U.S. summit meeting ended in Washington the other day. The Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Nuclear Missiles was signed during it. What questions did it answer, what problems remain to be solved? Our correspondent talked about this with disarmament problems specialist Aleksandr Georgiyevich Savelyev, staffer at the USSR Academy of Sciences World Economics and International Relations Institute.

[Savelyev] When you scrutinize the text of the treaty signed in Washington you are amazed at the document's many facets. Literally everything has been agreed on and formulated—production of missiles, their deployment, transportation, deployment sites [mesta dislokatsii], and all the procedures associated with their destruction. Each side must be completely confident that its partner is precisely fulfilling all the clauses in the agreement. So the document is also very important because the USSR and the United States have risen to a new level in matters of verification and monitoring.

The verification problem was seen as a particularly acute one in the atmosphere of suspicion that has existed and, basically, has not completely disappeared in relations between our countries. Suspicion is not the only cause of it. It seems to me that due attention was simply not paid to verification issues before. Moreover, in the years that we now call "stagnant" the Soviet Union reacted rather sharply to the West's demands, for example, on on-site inspections, seeing them as an attempt to get at our state secrets. Our country has been accused of allegedly violating the agreement in the arms limitation sphere, in particular the ABM Treaty, although each of the statements was accompanied by small but very meaningful qualifications: "probably," "possibly," "apparently"...

Of course, we have a right to claim that the charges are farfetched, that the United States made them up purely for propaganda purposes. But one could also draw the conclusion that the verification measures elaborated in

the sixties and the seventies and the national means of implementing them were evidently not enough, since the sides were still left with doubts about one another's scrupulousness.

[Novikov] The verification issue was clearly one of the most delicate at all the Soviet-U.S. talks?

[Savelyev] It is a question of the nature of secrecy. When, in fact, need a secret be strictly kept? The answer is obvious: if we intend to attack an opponent, take him by surprise. But if we intend to disarm, if we want to proceed along the path of trust, then that kind of secrecy can only do harm, in my view. The Soviet leadership is fully aware of this. Evidence of this is the recent trip by U.S. inspectors to the Krasnoyarsk radar station and to Shikhany, to the chemical weapons production facility, which has always been regarded as top secret.

Or take, for example, the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles. In fact, it incorporates the right to carry out a surprise inspection which must be granted to any side on request. All this is evidence of our leadership's new approach to verification issues.

[Novikov] We say that an important step has been taken... But fears remain regarding the treaty's ratification by the U.S. Senate.

[Savelyev] There are fears, of course. But, according to Western observers and judging by public opinion polls, the possibility of an unfavorable outcome is relatively small. Unless, of course, something extraordinary happens.

The fact that Americans are already afflicted by a morbid suspicion of the Soviet Union is another matter. Some reckon that since Gorbachev has signed the treaty it must be advantageous to the Soviet Union and, therefore, disadvantageous to the United States.

The only ones in the United States to have lost as a result of the signing of the treaty are the groups involved with the production of Pershing-2 and ground-based cruise missiles.

[Novikov] And the Soviet Union? Our readers want to know whether it has lost anything as a result of the signing of the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles.

[Savelyev] When answering this it is necessary to answer the question that is now beginning to be raised here in the Soviet Union as well: Was the USSR's deployment of SS-20 missiles in Europe a mistake? Did they ever provide anything in the security sphere? If so, then their elimination must by the same token reduce our security, because we are eliminating more than twice as many missiles as the United States. Each of them is not just there to intimidate, it has a specific target, a mission, it is part of a particular plan. But arguments purely from the standpoint of military logic cannot in any way diminish the supreme political significance of this decision. It was dictated by the new thinking, by an awareness that one simply cannot have a war now.

[Novikov] On 8 December President Reagan proudly pointed out that the treaty is an embodiment of the "zero option" he proposed back in 1981. Doesn't this mean that the U.S. stance on this issue has been more constructive than the Soviet stance from the start?

[At this point the interview incorporates the following boxed item: "I believe we must go forward and implement the ratification process. We must examine the question of reducing conventional arms and continue talks on strategic offensive arms."

[Bill Bradley, Democratic senator, member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence]

[Savelyev] It seems to me that if the Soviet Union had accepted the "zero option" then, Reagan and the United States would have used any excuse to abandon it. All the more reason to recall the atmosphere at the time, when there had been a sharp deterioration in relations between our two countries. Not only would the Americans not have ratified it, they would not even have signed it. Particularly as in politics, in relations between the two great powers attempts to dictate terms to the other side always prompt a sharp reaction. At that time the "zero option" looked like diktat vis-a-vis the Soviet Union.

One can approach disarmament issues in various ways: All or nothing, or step by step, in the spirit of the new thinking. At the moment we are moving step by step, and, I believe, it is the correct approach.

Kozyakov: Statements on SDI Cause 'Concern'

LD170412 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Earlier this week the United States' Defense Department has carried out a test under the SDI program. The test involved an intercontinental ballistic missile. Here is a commentary by Vladislav Kozyakov:

The report makes one stop and think about what attitudes should be adopted to outer space now that the summit in Washington decided to draw up an agreement on cutting in half strategic offensive weapons at an early date. The two sides came closer on a number of important issues at the summit, and appropriate agreements are to be drafted next year so that they can be signed during President Reagan's planned visit to Moscow.

Bearing this in mind, Mikhail Gorbachev and President Reagan instructed their respective delegations to the talks in Geneva to draft agreements whereby the two sides would not withdraw from the ABM Treaty during

an agreed upon term, and pledge to adhere to the treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972, in, among other things, conducting research and, if need be, tests allowed by the treaty.

The test carried out under the SDI most likely was within the scope of the ABM Treaty, but statements that have lately been made in Washington cause some concern. To all intents and purposes, they program the spreading of the arms race to outer space under any circumstances. According to them, the SDI weapons will be deployed as soon as they are ready. Claims that the summit in Washington reconciled differences over the SDI and that work on the program can be speeded up now appear to be strange.

Addressing a news conference in Washington, Mikhail Gorbachev underlined that the Soviet Union is firmly against the SDI. We will not be setting a space defense of our own, and we have called on the United States to follow suit. Mikhail Gorbachev said that the United States would assume full responsibility if it goes ahead with the SDI, and thereby upsets strategic stability and opens new avenues for an arms race that would be fraught with unpredictable consequences.

Upon his return to the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev appeared on Soviet television on Monday. He described calls for upgrading nuclear weapons and accelerating the SDI program as dangerous trends that may undermine the signs of a breakthrough in the process of demilitarizing international relations.

Nitze Addresses INF, START Issues

LD160915 Moscow TASS in English 0810 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 16 TASS—During the summit meeting last week General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and President Reagan accomplished much, said Paul Nitze, consultant of the President and the secretary of state on the strategic arms limitation talks.

Speaking at the National Press Club on Tuesday, he said that the success of the summit meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan provides evidence of the fact that "they signed the INF Treaty. They issued a joint statement which significantly advanced us towards a stabilizing S.T.A.R.T. treaty and they agreed on language on defense and cosmos which narrows the issues and promises to make them more manageable."

Paul Nitze underlined that "the Soviet leader has made a unique contribution" to moving the ball along at this stage of the game. "But we have no intention of resting on our laurels. On the contrary we want our success in INF to be the springboard for progress in other areas," he said. "Clearly our most immeidate and important task is to get the advise and consent of the Senate in favour of ratification. All of our other efforts depend on this outcome. Why should the Senate so advise the President? Because this treaty enhances the security of the United States and its allies."

"Similarly, the S.T.A.R.T. agreement we are seeking would be in our security interests. Despite all the progress we have made in S.T.A.R.T. the list of remaining issues is daunting. And the question arises of whether it is possible to complete a treaty during this administration. My own belief is that it will be very difficult but not impossible. We will be pushing forward intensively, and we will do our best to finish the job."

Plant To Switch From Missile-Related Output

PM161657 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 15 Dec 87 Single Edition p 4

[A. Kakovkin article under the rubric "TASS for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA": "Machine Tools Instead of Missiles"]

[Text] Votkinsk, Udmurt ASSR—An event which occurred at the Votkinsk machine building plant in the Udmurt ASSR right after the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles in Washington proved surprisingly symbolic. An automated transport and stacking system [avtomatizirovannaya transportno-nakopitelnaya sistema] has just been commissioned at this enterprise, which, in accordance with the agreement between our countries and in the event of the treaty being ratified by the USSR Supreme Soviet and the U.S. Senate, would be one of the facilities in the Soviet Union subject to inspection by means of permanent monitoring [kontrol na postoyannoy osnove]. This system is designed for the production of output not for defense but for strictly peaceful purposes—high-precision program-controlled machine tools.

This highly efficient technical innovation appeared in the recently commissioned new shop for the manufacture of these modern units which are so greatly needed by the national economy. The automated transport and stacking system links flexible readjustable lines of progressive machine tool equipment. Until now, the people of Votkinsk could have seen such advanced examples of new equipment only at exhibitions.

...Like a muscle man on stage, the robot easily picked up the required container with tools, instruments, and billets from the storage section and made its way toward the cluster of machine tools. After precisely delivering its load to its destination, it "seized" another container, this one with finished parts, for its return journey.

Just a few machine tool operators work in this shop. Their role boils down to observing the equipment's smooth operations. Everything in the shop has been planned with a view to the longer-term future, when just two duty operators could be left there alone with the computers and display units.

"The robot lines are much faster and better at performing operations that used to be done only by highly skilled machine tool operators," and shop chief A. Tugbayev pulled out of the container the just manufactured spindle of a future machine tool. "The fact that they are automatically supplied with all they need makes it possible to ensure the highly smooth operation of the production conveyor. Computer programs plan the manufacture of various component parts."

The assembly of high-precision mechanical processing [mekhanoobrabatyvayushchiy] machine tools, including those of the "processing center" type and up to the best world standards, is planned to begin in 1988. The enterprise's output of these machine tools will almost treble now. The new advanced equipment is awaited in all sectors of Soviet machine building.

"It is profoundly symbolic that the start-up of our new shop coincided in time with an historic event— the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles," O. Kobylkov, deputy secretary of the plant's party committee, said. "The output produced by the collective for peaceful purposes, which is already considerable, will significantly increase now. In addition to machine tool equipment, the products range now includes complete processing units for dairy plants, feed systems for drilling rig underwater well-boring control systems, car components, washing machines, and other consumer goods. The enterprise is steadily fulfilling its production programs for deliveries of all types of output. In this way, and in the event of the treaty being ratified by both sides, the accumulated experience will enable the collective to reorganize its production—not without costs, of course, but even so within the shortest time possible."

No matter who you talk to in Votkinsk now, everyone is fully prepared—regardless of everything, joyfully, and with a light heart—to change his partly defense industry profession and switch to the manufacture of articles needed for the reequipment of industry and the satisfaction of the people's urgent needs. Tangible proof of this is provided by the new shop, a most active part in whose creation was played by all of the enterprise's production subunits, which largely determined its successful commissioning ahead of schedule. As regards the possible reorganization of the plant's production, the following interesting idea is mooted here in this context: to pursue it jointly with U.S. firms.

Believing in the successful forthcoming ratification of the treaty, people in Votkinsk have decided to begin preparing in good time, without any delay, for its implementation. The enterprise leadership is already thinking out many complex internal economic matters connected with this. Moreover, it perceives as one of its priority concerns the creation of first-class living conditions in the city for the U.S. specialists so that they might feel at home here over the several years during which, in conformity with the treaty, they will monitor its observance on a permanent basis. This fact, which may at first appear insignificant against the background of the solution of a global problem, also goes to prove a lot—Soviet people's desire for mutual understanding with their partners, which guarantees the development of cooperation between two great peoples for the benefit of universal peace.

U.S. Assembling CW Shells Despite 'Commitment'
LD170014 Moscow TASS in English 0005 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 17 TASS—The United States started the assembly of the 155-millimetre binary chemical shells on December 16. They are the latest modification of the mass destruction weapons to be adopted for service by the U.S. Army. President Reagan described them as vitally important for the U.S. national security.

Binary chemical shells, which are a qualitatively new type of weapons, will be added to the huge arsenals of toxic agents stockpiled by the USA.

The assembly started after the Washington summit where the Soviet Union and the United States expressed their commitment to drawing up an international convention on banning and eliminating chemical weapons.

Declaring about its adherence to the cause of banning all chemical weapons, the U.S. Administration has again taken practical steps quite opposite to its words.

Round of Chemical Weapons Talks Ends
LD161806 Moscow TASS in English 1752 GMT 16 Dec 87

[text] Geneva December 16 TASS—Another round of multilateral talks on chemical weapons, held here during the past few weeks within the framework of the disarmament conference, ended here today.

The sides considered provisions of the future international convention on the prohibition and destruction of this type of weapons of mass annihilation, including verification and inspection measures.

The parties to the talks welcomed the fact that the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States, at their recent summit meeting, expressed their commitment to drafting such a document and reaffirmed the need for more intensive talks with a view to concluding a truly global and verifiable convention, covering all chemical weapon-capable states.

The talks within the framework of the Geneva conference will be resumed in January next year.

Medvedev, Dobrynin Receive Bloc Party Aides
PM161435 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Questions of Cooperation Discussed"]

[Text] A meeting took place 15 December in Moscow of the deputy chiefs of the BCP, MSZMP, Communist Party of Vietnam, the SED, the Workers Party of Korea, the Communist Party of Cuba, the Lao People's Revolutionary Party, the MPRP, the PZPR, the RCP, the CPSU, and the CPCZ Central Committee International Departments. They discussed some questions of international cooperation.

A.F. Dobrynin and V.A. Medvedev, CPSU Central Committee secretaries, received the meeting participants.

U.S.-Israeli Memorandum At Variance With Trends
LD171037 Moscow TASS in English 1009 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 17 TASS—From a TASS diplomatic correspondent:

The conclusion of another military agreement between the United States and Israel is at variance with the trend toward the relaxation of international tension. After the Soviet-American summit meeting this agreement is perceived as a document conserving a pole of cold in the Middle East amid an atmosphere of thaw in the world, a spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. told the TASS diplomatic correspondent.

It is believed in the Soviet diplomatic quarters that the agreement, called the "Memorandum of Understanding," is bound to aggravate tension in the region where it has already reached a fever pitch. In compliance with the agreement the United States is lifting restrictions on supplies of military hardware to Tel Aviv. This means that the state pursuing the policy of aggression toward the neighboring Arab countries and extending its boundaries at their expense will get the possibility to modernize its military potential without any hindrance.

Fears in the face of a buildup of the military power of Israel which has not renounced its territorial claims will most probably give rise to the desire among Arab countries to modernize their own forces. This will lead to a new spiral of the arms race in the region that already resembles a powder cellar.

The "memorandum" gives Israeli companies the opportunity to expand arms exports, the Foreign Ministry spokesman went on to say. It is common knowledge that military equipment from Tel Aviv is flowing mainly to reactionary regimes and military dictatorships in the Chilean mold and is used to suppress democratic forces and liberation movements.

At present, when the idea of devoting the funds currently spent on arms production and procurement to the needs of development is rallying an increasing number of supporters, the signing of the new military agreement between the United States and Israel comes as a challenge to the aspirations of people seeking a relief from the burden of military spending, the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said in conclusion.

USSR Delegation Head on Agreement on CSCE Aims
LD161731 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 16 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[TEXT] As previously reported, consultations have taken place between representatives of Warsaw Treaty and NATO member countries.

[V. Mikheyev; identified by caption] The Soviet-U.S. joint statement adopted a few days ago stresses the necessity for moving on as soon as possible to talks on reducing armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe. Consultations have been taking place here in Vienna since February this year on this question with the participation of delegations from 7 Warsaw Treaty countries and 16 NATO countries.

[Video shows Yu. B. Kashlev, head of the Soviet delegation] [Begin Kashlev recording] The task that we are dealing with here—to define the mandate for new talks on reducing armed forces and armaments in Europe—is not an easy one. First, nowhere else in the world is there such a concentration of troops and armaments as there is in Europe. Second, the talks should include discussions on reductions in armed forces and armaments over the whole continent, from the Atlantic to the Urals, and not just in some particular region of Europe. Third, historically certain asymmetries and disproportions have arisen in the troops and armaments of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO, and it is necessary to find some criteria for approaching solutions to this problem. Last, what is being prepared is not simply talks between one bloc and another but talks in an all-European context linked with the CSCE, that is, provision must be made to give not just to bloc member countries but also to neutral European countries the opportunity to participate in solving the problems of disarmament.

Therefore, while the talks are rather complicated and not simple, the Soviet-U.S. summit, the preparations for it and its results, have had a very powerful and favorable influence on the all-European Vienna meeting here in general and on our consultations with the NATO countries. I am glad to inform you that the text of the section dealing with the aims of the talks in the mandate for future talks has been agreed to and adopted here. It is envisioned that the aims of the talks will be to strengthen security and stability in Europe by means of lowering the balance of armed forces and conventional armaments, by eliminating asymmetries, and by eliminating the threat of surprise attack and large-scale offensive operations. A considerable reduction in armed forces is envisioned as well as limitations and other important provisions. [end recording]

Further on Violation of Japanese Airspace
OW170611 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Colonel General Nikolay Chervov of the Soviet Defense Ministry held a press conference with Japanese journalists in Moscow on 15 December. The press conference was held to deal with the recent violation of Japanese airspace by Soviet Air Force aircraft. The aircraft unknowingly violated Japan's airspace. Col Gen Chervov made the following remarks:

On 9 December, the TU-16 Air Force aircraft was flying from Cam Ranh city to a repair base in Vladivostok, when its navigation equipment suddenly developed problems near Japan's airspace. Weather conditions were complicated as well, resulting in the aircraft's unknowing intrusion into Japan's airspace. In response to a warning by Japanese planes the Soviet aircraft changed direction, but intruded into Japanese airspace even deeper due to the faulty navigation equipment. The pilots became aware of their mistake when they saw Okinawa Island. They immediately made a wide turn and left Japan's airspace. They were thus able to land at an airport near Pyongyang.

After making the above remarks, Col Gen Chervov also answered a question by a Japanese journalist as to what measures the Soviet Union will take to prevent a similar incident from occuring in the future. He said: First, all navigation equipment on TU-16 planes will be improved. In addition, all aircraft in this course will fly in a two-plane formation, strictly maintaining a distance of 3 kilometers. When aircraft lose sight of their consort planes, pilots will immediately report to their base or take other urgent measures.

PRAVDA Reviews Book on Current State of Capitalism

PM041447 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[Doctor of Economic Sciences A. Porokhovskiy article under the rubric "Bookshelf": "Bourgeois Society on the Threshold of 21st Century"]

[Text] A little more than 10 years separate us from the 21st century. The outgoing century has been the century of a social breakthrough. October 1917 is the starting point of the new epoch of social progress and true human history. For 70 years the world's first worker-peasant state—a reliable bastion of the world socialist community—has asserted the principles of freedom, equality, and justice.

However, the capitalist world has still not exhausted its potential and is seeking new ways of adapting to the changing historic conditions. To attempt to determine the potential of modern capitalism as the main obstacle to social liberation and renewal and to progress—this was the aim of the authors of the book under review (Footnote) (Capitalism at the End of the Century [Kapitalizm na iskhode stoletiya]. Scientific editor A.N. Yakovlev. Moscow, Political Literature Publishing House, 1987. 462 pages).

The following questions are often heard: How do the propositions put forward at the 27th CPSU Congress regarding the dialectical integrity of the world, its increased interdependence, and the need for new political thinking in the nuclear epoch and the program to create a nuclear-free world correlate with the Leninist theory of imperialism, the general crisis of capitalism, and peaceful coexistence between the two opposing social systems? What objective changes in the course of world development formed the basis of the new theoretical conclusions? I think the work under review gives well reasoned answers to these questions.

The analysis is distinguished above all by its systematic approach. It is a special kind of comprehensive approach, steming from the fact that modern capitalist society is a most complicated social organism. Each feature is the subject of study by philosophy, political economy, history, sociology, and so on. At the same time, today, more than ever, capitalism can be understood only through a comprehensive, interdisciplinary analysis of its system as a whole. Moreover, new conclusions, discoveries, and social forecasts are usually made precisely at the intersection of the various social sciences.

Under this approach general problems, an analysis of which provides the key to the study of particular phenomena, are brought to the fore. Creative implementation of this principle forms the basis of the structure of the book, which begins with a general formulation of the problem of the new realities and mankind's future. In the following chapters economists, philosophers, historians, and sociologists analyze in detail how in the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution the natural historical progress of productive forces influence base and superstructure phenomena of bourgeois society in the postwar period and changes in the role of political institutions in social development.

Of course, the essence of capital and the exploiter nature of bourgeois society and therefore also the fundamental patterns of its development could not change, since the economic and social roots of this social system remain as before. But, first, the methods and forms of exploitation of the working people have changed, the level of the socialization and monopolization of the economy has grown, new features have appeared in capitalist economic management, the influence of world economic relations on the internal processes of national economics has increased, and the contradictions have not been frozen in their development.

Second, alongside capitalism, a new social system has emerged, has grown, and continues to gather strength in the struggle against it. Third and finally, present-day imperialism (as shown in the book) is part of a contradictory but united, integral world.

More than a century has passed since the first capitalist monopolies appeared—the basis of imperialism. During this period corporations have not only strengthened their positions in the economy and society but have also been able to subordinate to their aims the state machine of bourgeois governments, to harness scientific and technical progress, and to foist their own values and priorities on the capitalist world. The authors' attention is focused on the problems of late 20th century capitalism's adaptation to the changing historical conditions.

Adapting itself to the gigantic growth of productive forces, to the sudden break with traditional technologies, and to the growing influence of the world socialist system on social progress, modern capitalism is maneuvering above all in the sphere of production relations.

The commodity nature of its economic mechanism has certainly remained unchanged. As before, competition and market relations play a decisive role, but in conditions of the growing socialization and internationalization of production, the gigantic growth of economic complexes of national and transnational monopolies, and the vigorous economic activity of the bourgeois states, reliance on market forces has ceased to satisfy the demands of the reproduction of capital and the desire of the bourgeoisie to prolong the existence of the capitalist system. Monopoly control [planomernost] has become an instrument for the domination of big business.

One more important aspect of the book cannot be ignored—its multifaceted nature. Often the authors of some works describe in detail how capitalism is assimilating the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution, while others talk about the poverty and underprivileged plight of the masses, the pernicious influence of unemployment, and the neocolonial exploitation of developing countries. The absence of an all-embracing approach to the realities of the capitalist world sometimes breeds, especially among young people, distrust of the work of scholars and journalists. In this book the reader will not simply find factual information revealing the exacerbation of social contradictions in bourgeois society, but will obtain a complete picture of the huge gulf between the progress of production and the monopolists' all-consuming desire for profit. The reactionary essence of imperialism in the final analysis contradicts the interests of mankind, which needs reliable and lasting peace on earth.

By its nature capital is cosmopolitan. Overcoming internal contradictions in the struggle for the division of profit, the bourgeoisie of various countries unite to preserve the exploiter system through common efforts. In these conditions the internationalism of the working people creating and strengthening human civilization and peace on our planet assumes special significance more than ever. Their banner in the modern epoch is the new political thinking, which shows the only correct path to a nuclear-free world and lasting international security.

"The new political thinking," the book stresses, "is the consciousness of people who are mature in thought and action, who are aware of their own power, of the interests and goals for which and the forms in which this power is utilized, and of the fruits which it can bear. This is the end of the era of the egotistical interests fostered for centuries in the system of private ownership" (p 7). Thanks to the persistent activity of the party and the Soviet state, the new political thinking is beginning to be established in the consciousness of the world public and in the practice of international and interstate relations.

A difficult path lies ahead to ensure peace as the main and decisive condition for mankind's progress on the threshold of the 21st century. The book under review makes a contribution to a realistic assessment of capitalism and shows the mechanics of its adaptation to contemporary conditions of social development, whose accumulated problems and contradictions cannot prevent the planet's peoples from maintaining peace.

'Achievements and Hopes' Program on Summit

LD170001 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 16 Dec 87

["Achievements and Hopes" program presented by Commentator Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, with Academician Maksimovich Primakov and Political Observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin]

[Text] [Levin] Hello there, Esteemed Comrades. Our program today is devoted to the results of the visit to Washington by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of our party's Central Committee, his talks with President Ronald Reagan of the United States, his meetings with other representatives of the U.S. Administration, and members of the U.S. legislature, and those accords which were reached there. I have in mind above all, naturally, the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles. You will know of course that, speaking on Soviet television, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev described the agreement as a major event in world politics, a triumph for the new political thinking. He called the signing of the treaty the main result of the Washington visit, and, to judge by the reaction throughout the world, the broadest circles of the world public agree with this.

At the focus of intensive talks which took up the greater part of the time were matters relating to the reduction of strategic offensive weapons. What is involved, in fact, is intensive preparation of a treaty on a 50% reduction in strategic offensive weapons, on the condition that the ABM Treaty is preserved in the form in which it was adopted in 1972. I would like to draw your attention to Mikhail Sergeyevich's remark that this was reflected in the joint statement on the results of the meeting.

In Washington, the Soviet Union again sharply raised the question of the need for the earliest conclusion of a treaty on the complete halting of nuclear tests. Questions on the elimination of chemical weapons and the reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces in Europe were discussed thoroughly. Much attention was devoted to questions of bilateral relations. There was discussion of problems connected with regional conflicts. In a word, the most vital problems in present-day international relations were discussed. The talks passed in a businesslike atmosphere, but they were of course far from cloudless. It can now be said with full justification that the work was very hard, but fruitful. We would like today to focus most of our attention on the fruitful side of the visit which has taken place.

[Shishlin] I think that this visit, this new full-scale summit, unquestionably has a many-sided significance. First, of course, it is above all of political significance, inasmuch as this was the first meeting on U.S. soil of a Soviet leader and a U.S. leader after a lapse of 13 years—I have in mind U.S. President Ford's last visit to our Soviet Maritime Kray. [sentence as heard] But this distance in time seems to me to be not so much a temporal one as a political one. In these 13 years there has been very much to cast a deep shadow on Soviet-U.S. relations, and only comparatively recently—2 years ago, strictly speaking—in Geneva, and subsequently in Reykjavik, the leaders of the two states met. Now we have had the Washington meeting.

When I talk of the meeting on U.S. soil, I regard this not only as symbolic, but I see in this the political distance that has been travelled as a result of these efforts, undertaken by both Washington and Moscow, both in Geneva and in Reykjavik, and the period between these meetings.

[Primakov] If one relates it all to these 13 years, it is absolutely clear how much more vividly the dynamics of our relations are now manifesting themselves and how the dynamism of these meetings has increased. I think that this stems directly from the fact that restructuring—democratization and restructuring—are taking place in our country. But for these internal processes there would be no commensurate stepping up of the effectiveness, or acceleration, of foreign policy processes and there would not be such dynamism in our relations with the United States which, all the same, play the greatest role in our network of international relations. Suffice it to say that our states have in their hands, roughly speaking, 95% of nuclear missile weaponry. It is we who above all determine whether there is to be war or not, whether there is to be peace or not, and how stable peace is to be. That is why it seems to me that when we speak of the present successes of the Washington meeting, one has to bear in mind that these successes have their roots in our internal affairs and in those transformations that have started to be implemented in our country since the April 1985 plenum.

[Shishlin] This seems to me to be a very important and essential point; it is, simply, a key point. If we are now to consider the foreign policy results of the Washington meeting, of the very packed and intensive discussions that took place, it would be difficult to get to the bottom of what is happening by turning our attention away from our internal affairs. I shall not conceal the fact that in the political commentaries on the results of the Washington meeting being made at the highest level, both in the United States and the West European capitals, stress is very frequently laid on the idea that the West had supposedly formulated a position of strength, a firm line aimed at eliminating the imbalance in weapons with the Soviet Union, as they call it. Now, they say, here are the results. But in fact, if we are to talk of who came with what positon, our leader went to the United States possessing a very strong base within his country in the shape of the policy of restructuring, democratization, and radical economic reform—a policy of glasnost.

[Primakov] That is the imbalance—it was not in the military sphere! This strengthened the position extraordinarily, I quite agree with you. Nikolay Vladimirovich happened to be in Washington during the visit, and we

could see how attitudes had changed toward us—and we have a point of comparison, because we have been to Washington before—and we could see that attitudes had altered unprecedentedly. I'll tell you about the press, for instance. Take the first interview given by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, the one carried on NBC. It received the highest ratings—it was seen by more people than a program in which 12 U.S. presidential candidates appeared. All 12 were brought together and the program was well hyped—it had top billing, so to speak. But Mikhail Sergeyevich's interview, even before his arrival, attracted many more listeners. That is an extremely telling fact.

Moreover, I'll tell you a rather curious and perhaps amusing story. The Americans like humor. They often have these shows in the middle of their television programs. They showed a newsreader—a supposed newsreader, played by one of their well-known comedians—who was reading the news on one of the channels. This was all accompanied by laughter, because the news was interestingly selected, interestingly interpreted, and so on. But then, most importantly, he was asked who was in closest contention among all the U.S. Presidential candidates. He said: Let me show you the chart. He uncovered it, and Gorbachev's name was at the top!

[Shishlin] I would like to add the following point that I gathered from my chats with Americans. They all called attention to the fact that during the interview Mikhail Sergeyevich granted to NBC, all the Americans with whom I had occasion to talk called attention to the fact that young people watched that interview with vast attention. They watched extremely attentively. They were extremely impressed by Soviet policy, by the Soviet line, by the Soviet account of their approach both to internal and to external problems. It was against that new political background that dialogue got under way.

[Levin] Nikolay Vladimirovich, I would like to support your idea that the position of strength from which the West speaks is not always a strong position. For a strong position does not necessarily have to rely on military might although, let us be frank: If the USSR did not have adequate military might, negotiations on limiting armaments and eliminating armaments simply would not have taken place.

[Primakov] That is so. But even in this regard, some criteria are changing on the U.S. side—very slowly perhaps, very insignificantly so far, but they are changing. This dynamic is observable. While I was there, for example, I watched a speech on television by Dukakis. He is one of the Democratic Party candidates, a governor, a respectable person. Many people consider that ie is one of the main candidates. Out of all the Democrats, he is given preference. Well, he made a speech. What did he say that was of interest? Of course, he spoke about internal affairs. They always pay very great attention to internal affairs. But he also said that we should elect the sort of President who could for 4 years sit across the table from Gorbachev, as he put it, and be sufficiently equipped, sufficiently prepared in order to conduct a dialogue with him on equal terms. That is what Dukakis said. Previously they would always have said that what was needed was a man who was strong, who would bang his fist on the table, who threatens, who is backed by vast military might. But now they speak differently: He must be equipped, he must be intellectually prepared for this. It is this criteria which is employed to look at a large number of things. For example, when Mikhail Sergeyevich had a meeting with the leaders of the U.S. Congress, Nikolay Vladimirovich and I later watched television and there was a real interrogation as they say, a real cross-examination, if you like, of these congressmen in Congress when they went there. What questions did you raise? What sort of impression did the Soviet leader make on them, and so on. One of the conclusions to which one of these congressmen came to was—and he said literally as follows: You know, not one of our presidential candidates is up to the Soviet leader, not one is good enough to be an equal partner for him. You see, that is how we are regarded in the United States now. That is the result not only of the force of individual personalities, but mainly of what is being done in our country.

[Levin] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, to support what you have said, I would like to cite one example of how Western Europe reacted to this visit. Here is what the British SUNDAY TIMES newspaper writes about Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to Washington. Almost everyone that he met in the U.S. capital remained under a deep impression from these meetings. In the words of one of the Congressmen—and the British paper repeats this opinion favorably—Gorbachev possesses the qualities of a political leader which the world has not seen since the time of World War II. The Soviet leader really amazed Western politicians, pleased the press, and caused rejoicing among ordinary Americans.

[Shishlin] That is what the political background was like in Washington. A background is one thing but results are another. I think that the fact of the conclusion of the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles—no matter how some people try to belittle the importance of this agreement—was, in essence a turning point. Yes, there is no doubt. This really is 4% off the nuclear arsenals. But of far greater psychological importance than military arithmetic is the very fact that for the first time two classes of nuclear missiles are being eliminated. That is a step which no one has managed to implement throughout the whole endlessly long history of talks on curbing the arms race. It is a real turning point. It can be compared with the following position, that some people are on the doorstep of a house and fear to enter that door. Now the USSR and the United States have entered that door. There we shall find a mass of new things, a mass of new opportunities, a mass of new locations for jointly engaging in things which are really key elements for politicians—ensuring firm peace, removing the threat of war, and overcoming confrontation. I think that

this thought is fundamental. It was expressed by Mikhail Sergeyevich when he was assessing the importance of the visit and he repeated the assessment that we have really come to a moment when the opportunity is opening up for departing from the state of confrontation. It can be said straight out that the brakes have been applied to this growth in tension.

[Primakov] Moreover, I would like to say that two aspects that were characteristic of our positions have now become universal approaches. The first is that we were the ones who pushed it through. With every effort we pushed the matter through so that the process of arms reduction went ahead uninterrupted, so that some kind of individual act did not occur, following which there is a pause, and the next wave is not drawn into that gap. We, and, properly speaking, Comrade Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, and the others in the many contacts before this visit, worked up such an agenda that without fail there would not only be talk about the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles, but there would immediately be talk of preparing a new agreement. This is one aspect. The second aspect, I would say, is a methodological one, but it is extremely important. This was part of our standpoint as well and we also managed to push it through. It consisted of the fact that one must proceed along a broad front. We do not shun any directions that can lead to an improvement of the international situation and the situation in our relations. That is why I want to stress this.

Nikolay Vladimirovich, you will remember perfectly how before the Geneva meeting President Reagan announced: Let us start from conflicts, then move on to trust, and then arms reductions. You see that was the U.S. philosophy, that was the U.S. approach, philosophically speaking. What is left of it? Nothing at all! Now the talk has been about both arms reductions and about the fact that regional conflict situations must be eliminated, and about human rights, and about bilateral relations, and so on, that is, over the whole broad front without setting one subject against another.

But can one draw the conclusion from that that everything has already been resolved, that everything has, so to speak, been cleared, the obstructions have all been removed and in the future our relations will have a clear open road before them? Of course not. Of course not. Those of us who were in the United States convinced ourselves not only of the fact that the greater part of the people were in favor, and not only that many politicians have grown wiser, but that there are those who would like to stop that process no matter what. Here, in this connection, I recall how THE WASHINGTON POST—that is evidently the main newspaper in Washington, in any case the one with the widest circulation—published in the space usually taken up by paid advertisements a letter signed by dozens of retired people, mainly admirals, generals, and so on, who were speaking out against improving relations with the Soviet Union.

[Levin] Now, as we all know, the center of gravity in the struggle is shifting to the Senate, which has to ratify the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles. A few days ago, there was a fleeting report which, it seems to me, provides the key to an understanding of the approach of different politicians to that agreement. This key was in an article by former U.S. Defense Secretary Harold Brown. He writes that although they will grumble about the treaty on medium-range nuclear weapons, the opponents of arms control, who are in the main Republicans, will save their main strike for the agreement on reductions in strategic weapons. That is what you, Nikolay Vladimirovich, were saying. We have opened the door, we have started things moving, but without a doubt there are in the United States forces that would very much like to slam that door shut. The treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles alarms them, it seems to me, not only in itself alone, but alarms them precisely as the first step that can—and we believe should—lead to radical reductions in nuclear weapons and, in the final count, to the elimination of nuclear weapons.

[Shishlin] But Viktor Nikolayevich, only if it understood that we should not imagine things in such a way that the door opened only because the Soviet Union took the initiative. [sentence as heard] The agreement worked out by the two countries, the two sides, is the common success of Washington and of Moscow.

[Levin] And of the whole world.

[Shishlin] Well, it does indeed correspond to the interests of the entire world community, the interests of consolidating security. Therefore, I think that from the point of those military and political decisions that have been made in Washington, that they are really of great importance, that that is indeed an event of worldwide scale, of simply tremendous scale. But as Yevgeniy Maksimovich has already mentioned here, other questions were also discussed in Washington. During the discussion of these questions, naturally both a measure of difference and the depth of those differences became apparent, differences in the approaches of our countries to those, let us say, regional conflicts.

[Levin] But, as you know, I sometimes get the impression, I often catch myself thinking, that one wants to get an optimal result instantaneously. But, you see, in general the result that has been achieved did not fall out of the skies. What a difficult path has been travelled. We recall how that Reykjavik meeting was appraised. At first, the Western press evaluated the meeting in Reykjavik almost unanimously as a failure, as something unsuccessful. Today, everyone can see that this was not the case at all. It was not like that at all. Without Reykjavik the meeting in Washington would not have taken place.

[Primakov] Would you like me to put forward one very paradoxical idea? It is extremely paradoxical, especially in retrospect when you are now taking a look at Reykjavik. I believe it was a good thing that at the very last moment the Americans did not sign. If Reagan had signed that thing then, he would have come up against such resistance in his country that the affair could have miscarried and pushed us back for a long time. Precisely the fact that he did not sign it and precisely the fact that such a well thought-out, clear-cut, constructive program was put forward by us: That allowed all the sound forces to be mobilized in support of that movement forward. I may be wrong but I think that the role that history played here was a good one.

[Levin] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, it seems to me that you have touched on an interesting theme here and no matter how paradoxical this might seem, the opinion does exist—or at least, I have heard this opinion—that all of this could have been achieved in Reykjavik. But I think that this would have been bad and not only for Reagan. I get the impression that at that moment Western Europe would not have been ready for such a radical solution. See what a struggle there was after Reykjavik in Western Europe on the problem of medium- and shorter-range missiles.

[Primakov] True, true.

[Levin] See how much work had to be done for Europe, Western Europe, to comprehend the whole significance both for its own security and for the security of the whole of our continent—the significance of the solving of this problem. Although your idea might really seem paradoxical at first glance, it is deeply logical.

[Primakov] Now, if we could move on to a question which you have raised about the chance of ratification. The agreement is, of course, a good one, but it still needs to be ratified. Judging by the conversations that Nikolay Vladimirovich has had and which I have had and which our colleagues had when they were in Washington during this historic—and I do not fear to use this word—visit, the impression has been created that now even the most right-wing people in the Senate will not come out openly against this treaty. It is hardly likely to happen openly. Of course, it may be that many amendments will be piled up. Some of them will be purely for publicity to show their electors that they...

[Levin interrupts] ...are really involved in what is going on.

[Primakov] Yes, they really know what is going on. They want to play some role themselves, and join in what is going on in one way or another. I do not think that these amendments are any particular threat. But there will be attempts to use amendments to change the character and the sound of many of the articles of that treaty, and the struggle against that is already beginning. It is very interesting that this is being combatted in the United States now not just by the liberal forces but also by those who signed the treaty. They will come out against that.

[Shishlin] In this context, of course, it is probably right to stop and think about what is happening in the United States right now. The feeling is that the axis of political life in the United States is shifting from some sort of extreme right-wing position to the center. This is also evident from the course of the preelection struggle by the claims which are being made by the Republican and Democrat candidates. No, liberals, as before, are not in fashion. Liberals, as before, are not popular in the United States. But public opinion is moving away from extreme right-wing positions—and one may say to a certain extent that the administration, which has always stubbornly clung to the extreme right wing, is also rather changing its political colors.

[Levin] Well, you know, here is another, it seems to me, very interesting remark. The SAN JOSE MERCURY NEWS—to be honest, this is the first time that I have come across anything from this newspaper...

[Primakov interrupts]: And you decided to please our listeners!

[Levin] No, it turns out to be very interesting. It is interesting by virtue of the fact that it is published in the administrative center of Silicon Valley, where many enterprises of the U.S. military-industrial complex are concentrated. This newspaper took upon itself the task of summing up the attitude to the Soviet-U.S. treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles on the part of the military business.

This paper claims that our Russian proverb: Trust, but verify, which is so frequently heard at summit meetings, sounds like music to the many military contractors in Silicon Valley. The local companies which specialize in the production of the most complex and top-secret tracking systems, will, it seems, derive a profit from the need to verify that the Soviet Union is complying with the medium-range missile treaty, many representatives of the military industry and experts believe. So the military-industrial complex in no way has an unequivocal attitude to this; although it tries to adapt itself to the changing situation, at the end of the day, if they concentrate their efforts on creating a tracking system, then in any event it is no longer a threat to the security of the Soviet Union, especially as we all know that Mikhail Sergeyevich told Reagan that our national means, worked out by our Soviet specialists, enable us to determine the existence of nuclear weapons on board surface vessels and submarines. If there is an accord on a 50% reduction in strategic offensive armaments, we can even share our information in this field.

But, first and foremost, I would like now to draw our listeners' attention to precisely the fact that the military-industrial complex does not, I would say, react so inflexibly and blindly to the changing situation. No, it is evidently trying to keep its revenue. But it is not making a frontal attack on the treaty; rather, it is trying to seek some other options. This, clearly, is also a reflection of the definite changes which are occurring in the United States.

[Shishlin] But the connection here is probably not just this, because the overall state of the U.S. economy is prompting U.S. big business to think seriously about those large problems which face the development of that country's national economy. These are things like the huge foreign debt and the budget deficit, and many, many other problems.

[Levin] In conclusion, I would like to go back again to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's address on Soviet television. As you recall, he drew attention there to the fact that resistance is now increasing on the part of those who link their political and material prosperity with old opinions. We, Comrade Gorbachev said, calculate that the world community, especially the peoples of the United States and the Soviet Union and the healthy forces in all countries, will double their efforts to protect the first shoot of nuclear disarmament, which has pushed through the rock-hard layer of prejudices and stereotypes of hostility. It is now very important, as people say, for us all to work together to promote the deepening of positive trends and the strengthening of mutual understanding and cooperation.

The accords reached represent a historic opportunity for all mankind to begin to throw off the heavy burden of militarism and war, which have not only taken monstrous human sacrifices but also retarded economic development and material culture and fettered freedom and the spiritual and social creativity of the peoples. The Soviet Union is ready to make every effort to consolidate peace.

At this point our program today has come to an end. Thank you, Esteemed Comrades, for your attention, and all the best.

Zalyghin Discusses Relations After Summit

LD161317 Moscow TASS in English 1301 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 16 TASS—The results of the recent Soviet-U.S. summit make it possible to look upon the future of relations between the two countries with optimism, well-known Soviet writer Sergey Zalyghin told TASS.

Zalyghin, who is editor-in-chief of the literary monthly NOVY MIR, was in Washington at the time of the meeting together with other Soviet intellectuals.

"The first, and apparently the most difficult, step has been taken towards reducing the stocks of deadly weapons," he said in the interview.

He said people had lately been too trustful of the deceptive magic of new kinds of weaponry and computers. "Even the most advanced computer cannot determine the value of a human life which is in effect invaluable," Zalyghin said, adding that the summit had demonstrated a mutual understanding of the human factor.

The writer, who has visited the United States more than once, noted changes in the Americans' attitude to the Soviet Union. He said they had in a measure been due to the perestroyka policy adopted here.

"Meeting with U.S. intellectuals, I detected an increased interest in our culture, literature, in what is now published in this country and printed in Soviet literary journals," Zalyghin said.

Opinion Poll Conducted on Results of Summit

LD161335 Moscow TASS in English 1316 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 16 TASS—Ninety-eight per cent of 500 Muscovites polled by scientists of the Institute of Sociological Studies under the USSR Academy of Sciences have positively assessed the results of the Soviet-American summit meeting. 89 per cent believe that it will promote the improvement of Soviet-American relations.

"Most of the polled highly appreciate the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles signed by the leaders of the two countries", Yelena Bashkirova, Cand. SC. (philosophy), one of the organizers of the public opinion poll, told TASS. At the same time, some people are doubtful over its possible ratification by the U.S. Senate. 23 per cent of Muscovites believe that chances for it are good, 48 per cent—that they are average and 10 per cent—that they are bad.

The results of the public opinion poll show that Soviet people pin on the INF Treaty hopes of a further development of the nuclear disarmament process. 93 per cent of the polled spoke in favour of holding another meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan. 55 per cent believe that a treaty on 50 per cent reduction of strategic nuclear arsenals can be coordinated before the U.S. President comes to Moscow for a return visit.

Comparison of Gorbachev 9 Dec Luncheon Speech

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian in its 10 December 1987 second edition carries a TASS report under the general heading "Political Course Aimed at Better Mutual Understanding." This version has been compared to the

9 December Moscow TASS in English version, broadcast at 2135 GMT and published on page 15 of the 10 December Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, revealing the following variations:

Page 16:

Column one, paragraph seven, first sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...cold war alongside "small wars" that have taken... (substituting "small wars" for "local conflicts")

Page 17:

Column one, paragraph two, first sentence reads: ...one, was made yesterday toward a more... (substituting "yesterday" for "today")

Column one, paragraph three, sentence two reads: ...embarked on restoring the peacemaking mission of politics. It... (rephrasing)

Column one, paragraph four, sentence one reads: ...politics change, the purpose of diplomacy changes... (substituting "purpose" for "predestination")

Column two, paragraph six, only sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...congratulations to you.

The speeches by G. Shultz and M.S. Gorbachev were applauded.

At the end of the luncheon students from Yale University gave a "Russian Choir" concert.

G. Shultz and M.S. Gorbachev visited an exhibition of photographs on the Soviet Union displayed by TASS in the State Department. It also included photographs of the beginning of the Soviet leader's visit. (supplying additional material)

Inter-edition Comparison of Gorbachev Speech

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 10 December 1987 on page 4 of its first edition carries a TASS report under the headline "Building International Relations Is a Common Cause." This version has been compared with the 10 December PRAVDA second edition item carried under the same headline, published on page 32 of the 15 December Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, revealing the following variations:

Page 32:

Column one, paragraph six, sentence one, first edition reads: ...country's life and hugely influenced the formation... (adding "hugely")

Same paragraph, last sentence, first edition reads: ...Gorbachev had met and exchanged opinions with some of them before, including at the Moscow... (adding "and exchanged opinions," substituting "including" for "in particular")

Column one, paragraph seven, only sentence reads: ...the embassy included public figures and politicians: T. Gittins, president of... (adding passage)

Same sentence, first edition reads: ...the antiwar movement; representatives of the scientific world: R. Adams, president of the Smithsonian Institute; K. Galbraith, the economist; Prof B. Lown... (adding passage, omitting "well-known")

Same sentence, first edition reads: ...for strategic studies; cultural figures: J. Denver, singer of antiwar songs; the actors R. de Niro... (adding "cultural figures" and "of antiwar songs")

Column two, paragraph two, first edition reads: ...Speech [subhead]

I am glad of this meeting, sincerely glad, and cordially welcome you to this hall. I value the fact that, although you are very busy, there are people here who have responded to the invitation and left their work in order to meet me. And if there... (rewording)

Page 33:

Column one, paragraph two, sentence one, first edition reads: ...to you: Are we, the representatives of... (adding "we")

Column one, paragraph four, only sentence reads: ...(Vance, Mr Kissinger, Mrs Kirkpatrick, Mr Peterson, and others, we... (changing order of names)

Column one, paragraph five, sentence two reads: ...take account of other interests. If you strive for a balance of interests. The Soviet Union... (substituting "other interests" for "the interests of others," omitting "indeed")

Column one, paragraph six, sentence one reads: ...leading up to. There are new realities which dictate their new imperatives—what we call the challenge of the time. We are all children of our time. This is our wealth... (rewording)

Same paragraph, sentence three reads: ...acted before in a particular situation and what the world was like then, and if we ask whether we can act now in the modern... (rewording)

Column two, paragraph two, penultimate sentence reads: ...element to politics. We have lost a great deal because politics are frequently immoral. To overcome this we are prepared... (adding passage, substituting "overcome this" for "that end")

Page 34:

Column one, paragraph three, penultimate sentence reads: ...this complex path forward in a sensible... (adding "forward")

Column one, paragraph four, sentence two, first edition reads: ...of the historical path is not always... (substituting "path" for "past")

Same paragraph, sentence five reads: ...policy of restructuring. In 2 and... (omitting "In brief")

Same paragraph, sentence seven reads: ...and we have taken these paths. The process is not easy. There is nothing to hide. Comrade Zalygin, the editor... (substituting "taken these paths" for "gone forward" and "Comrade" for "S.P.")

Column one, paragraph five, first sentence reads: ...have no alternative. The alternative is stagnation, standstill, and... (rewording)

Column one, last paragraph, sentence four reads: ...increasing amount of practically difficult, serious, profound, and responsible work to be done. Now we have begun... (substituting "practically" for "practical," adding "now")

Same paragraph, sentence nine, first edition reads: ...some of you have written that... (omitting "here today")

Same paragraph, penultimate sentence reads: ...we shall succeed. We shall combine... (omitting passage)

Column two, paragraph three, sentence four reads: ...mechanically to apply his ideas to life today... (substituting "his ideas" for "what he said")

Column two, paragraph four, penultimate sentence reads: ...by the whole human community and all its members. We are open... (rewording)

Same paragraph, last sentence, first edition reads: ...and choice of everyone.

In short, we will steadfastly... (substituting "everyone" for "every people," adding "in short")

Page 35:

Column one, first paragraph, sentence one reads: As for relations with America, I do not how we can put up with such a state of our economic and trade ties any longer. We have virtually no ties with you.

True, this shows... (rewording, changing paragraph structure)

Column one, paragraph one, sentence four reads: But have we really wanted to... (omitting "through our history")

Same paragraph, last sentence, first edition reads: ...know, for example, your business people.

The time has come when you and I must indeed consider everything—where we are at, the stage we have reached—and give thought to how we are to live together in this... (omitting "the opinion of" and ellipses, and rewording)

Column one, paragraph three, first sentence reads: ...has been nourished today by social attitudes and... (substituting "today by" for "by present")

Column one, paragraph four, sentence two reads: ...as John Denver, the popular American singer; William Fulbright, the former senator; Bernard Lown, the well-known physician and U.S. cochairman of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War movement; and Kenneth Galbraith, the well-known scientist and economist, stressed the need to expand Soviet-U.S. cooperation in various spheres.

The president of... (expanding and rewording)

Column one, paragraph five, sentence one, first edition reads: ...Montandon advocated expanding contacts between American and Soviet schoolchildren. Replying to P. Montandon's statements, M.S. Gorbachev said that it is essential to prepare and bring up a new generation which will approach Soviet-U.S. relations differently in many... (rewording)

Comparison of Gorbachev Embassy Dinner Speech

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 11 December 1987 carries in its Second Edition on page 1 a TASS report on the speech given by M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, given at a dinner at the Soviet Embassy in honor of U.S. President Reagan on 9 December. The PRAVDA report, entitled "Protect the Modern World From Destruction," has been compared with the Moscow TASS in English version published in the 10 December Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 22, column one, and reveals the following variations:

Page 22:

Column one, paragraph one, PRAVDA begins: ...[Text] Washington, 10 Dec—On Wednesday, M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, gave a dinner in the Soviet Embassy in honor of U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

Present in the hall were G. Bush, vice president of the United States, J. Wright, speaker of the House of Representatives, W. Rehnquist, chief justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, G. Shultz, U.S. secretary of state, F.

Carlucci, U.S. defense secretary, W. Verity, secretary of commerce, and representatives of the White House, the U.S. State Departmen', and American business circles.

Present for the Soviet side were E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev, A.F. Dobrynin, V.M. Kamentsev, S.F. Akhromeyev, A.S. Chernyayev, and representatives of science and culture.

M.S. Gorbachev delivered a speech.

Speech by M.S. Gorbachev

Esteemed Mr. President,... (picking up with column two, paragraph two, and supplying additional material)

Column two, paragraph ten, last sentence reads: ...Such is the scope of our responsibility.

Ladies and Gentlemen! Without confidence in the future, without... (supplying the phrase "Ladies and Gentleman")

Column two, penultimate paragrpah, only setence reads: ...it is, as we understand it, close to public thought in America.

Back in 1945, at a time when the first... (rewording, deleting editorial notation)

Page 23:

Column one, paragraph two, only sentence reads: ...on which it would be possible today to reach mutual understanding or make progress, if... (supplying the word "mutual")

Column one, paragraph four, only sentence reads: ...Investments in disarmament and peace are the most reliable, promising, and long-term input of capital. (rewording, supplying the word "long-term")

Column one, paragraph eight, only sentence reads: ...Children show to us an example of how one should get rid of prejudices, preconceptions, and boring stereotypes. (supplying the word "preconceptions")

Comparison of Reagan USSR Embassy Dinner Speech

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 11 December 1987 carries in its Second Edition on page 1 a TASS report on the speech given by U.S. President Ronald Reagan at a dinner at the Soviet Embassy in his honor on 9 December. The PRAVDA report, entitled "Protect the Modern World From Destruction," has been compared with the Moscow TASS in English version published in the 10 December Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 23, column two, and reveals the following variations:

Page 23:

Column two, paragraph one, PRAVDA begins: ...[Text] Speech by R. Reagan.

Mr. General Secretary,... (picking up with paragraph four of item, sole sentence, providing alternative opening)

Column two, penultimate paragraph, sentence three, line four reads: ...you could have a chance to meet the the people who live and work here. Unfortunately, they're all in Iowa and... (rewording passage)

Column two, last paragraph, sentence two, last line reads: ...my address to the Soviet and American peoples.

It's an account of one of our... (picking up with page 24, paragraph one, substituting "Soviet and American peoples" for "people of the Soviet Union")

Page 24:

Column one, paragraph four, sentence one reads: ...We have always prided ourselves, Mr General Secretary, on our... (supplying the word "always")

Column one, paragraph four, sentence one, line three reads: ...with no attempts to gloss over the serious differences that divide us, differences... (substituting "serious" for "deep")

Column one, penultimate paragraph, sentence one, line two reads: ...your own country there is a sense of the need for greater glasnost and the whole world is watching the course of this process with great interest and attention. When talking of openness... (rewording passage)

Column one, last paragraph, sentence one, line two reads: ...a season of spirit to which you recently paid tribute, Mr General Secretary, when you noted... (rewording passage)

Column two, paragraph three, last sentence, last line reads: ...last attempt at Russian, za vashe zdorovye. (PRAVDA ends)

Comparison of Farewell Ceremony, Reagan Speech

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 11 December 1987 in its Second Edition on pages 1 and 2 carries a TASS report entitled "M.S. Gorbachev's Official Send-Off Ceremony at the White House." This version combines the 10 December Moscow TASS in English item broadcast at 1947 GMT, found on page 8 of the 11 December Soviet Union DAILY REPORT (entitled "White House Departure Ceremony"), and the 10 December Moscow TASS in English item broadcast at 2040 GMT, found on page 9 of the same DAILY REPORT (entitled "Reagan Speaks at Departure").

PRAVDA begins: [Text] Washington, 10 Dec—The state flags of the Soviet Union and the United States had flown around the whole perimeter of the White House

for 4 days. M.S. Gorbachev's official visit to Washington was finishing today. Many Washingtonians had come to Pennsylvania Avenue to see for themselves the Soviet leader's official send-off ceremony at the White House.

An honor guard was drawn up on the South Lawn of the presidential residence. Prominent politicians, statesmen, public figures, representatives of business circles, and diplomats were assembled.

The following were present:

Eduard... (picking up at page 9, column one, paragraph three; supplying alternate introduction, rewording)

Page 9, column one, paragraph ten, only sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...members of Congress.

The leaders of the two countries ascended the rostrum.

The U.S. President went to the microphone.

Speech by R. Reagan [subhead]

Mr General Secretary, (picking up at page 9, column one, penultimate paragraph; rewording)

Page 9:

Column one, last paragraph, sentence two reads: ...pleased to report upon the completion... (deleting "that")

Column two, paragraph one, sentence two, PRAVDA reads: ...as we leave it, it is up... (rewording, removing editorial note)

Column two, paragraph two, sentence two, PRAVDA uses "otkrovenno" for "candidly";

Column two, paragraph three, sentence two, PRAVDA uses "otkrovennyye" for "straightforward";

Column two, paragraph five, sentence four, PRAVDA uses "otkrovenno" for "bluntly";

Same paragraph, sentence seven reads: suffering in these wars. The door has been opened. And it will stay open to serious discussions on ending these wars.

And as far as open doors are concerned, Mr Gorbachev and I both agree on the desirability of more extensive personal... (picking up at paragraph six, first sentence, substituting "wars" for "regional conflicts" and omitting "freer and";

Page 10:

Column one, paragraph four, sentence two, PRAVDA uses "otkrovennyy" for "straightforward";

Column one, paragraph five, last sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...in this task.

During World War... (picking up paragraph seven, sentence one, omitting two sentences)

Column one, last paragraph reads: ...on your journey. (PRAVDA ends)

Comparison of Gorbachev Farewell Speech

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 11 December 1987 carries in its Second Edition on page 2 a TASS report on the speech given by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, given at his send-off from the United States at the White House. The PRAVDA report, entitled "M. S. Gorbachev's Official Send-off at the White House," has been compared with the Moscow TASS in English version published in the 11 December Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 10, column two and reveals the following variations:

Page 10:

Column two, paragraph one, PRAVDA begins: ...[Text] M. S. Gorbachev's Speech

Esteemed Mr President, Esteemed... (picking up with paragraph two, sentence one, providing alternative opening)

Column two, paragraph two, last sentence reads: ...Soviet-American relations and on topical aspects of the world situation.

A good deal has... (picking up with paragraph three, sentence one, rewording passage and deleting the word "important")

Column two, paragraph six, sentence one reads: ...A substantial result of the Washington talks is that... (substituting "substantial" for "useful")

Column two, paragraph seven, sentence one, line three reads: ...the importance of meetings with memebers of Congress, with other political figures, business circles, representatives of the public, science, and culture, and media executives. Such contacts enable us... (rewording passage)

Page 11:

Column one, paragraph one, sentence one reads: ... a growing desire in American society for improved, enhanced Soviet-American relations. That is to say, what we have seen here is an... (rewording passage)

Column one, paragraph two, sentence one, line three reads: ...to see not only its capital, but also come into direct contact with its great people, and debate with and speak to ordinary Americans face to face.

I believe that what we have accomplished... (picking up with paragraph three, sentence one, rewording passage)

Column one, paragraph five, sentence two reads: ...and peace to all Americans. Thank you.

The two leaders' speeches were greeted with applause.

R. Reagan and his wife bade farewell to M.S. Gorbachev and his wife. The motorcade with motorcycle escort left the White House. The Soviet leader was greeted by Washingtonians assembled in the streets near the White House. (PRAVDA ends, deleting "and good-bye," and supplying additional two paragraphs)

Comparison of Joint Summit Statement

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on pages 1 and [illegible] December 1987 First Edition carries the "Joi[illegible] American Statement at Summit Level." This ver[illegible] been compared with the 11 December Moscow [illegible] English version, broadcast at 1023 GMT and [illegible] on page 15 of the 11 December Soviet Union [illegible] REPORT, revealing the following variations:

PRAVDA omits subheads throughout the item, retaining only the roman numerals I through V as subheads;

Page 15:

Column two, paragraph one, PRAVDA omits dateline;

Same paragraph, last sentence reads: ...December 7-10, 1987.

Taking part in the talks on the Soviet... (picking up next paragraph, rewording)

Column two, paragraph three, only sentence reads: ...Howard H. Baker, Assistant to the U.S. President on National Security Colin L. Powell, counselor... (rewording Powell's title)

Column two, last paragraph, first sentence reads: ...held comprehensive and thorough [obstoyatelnyy] discussion on the... (substituting "thorough" for "detailed" and supplying vernacular)

Same paragraph, sentence two reads: ...The talks were frank [otkrovennyy] and constructive, reflecting... (substituting "frank" for "candid" and supplying vernacular)

Page 16:

Column one, paragraph three, sentence two reads: ...guided by their solemnly proclaimed conviction that a... (rewording)

Column one, paragraph four, last sentence reads: ...contribute, with other countries and peoples, to the building... (substituting "countries and peoples" for "nations")

Column one, last paragraph, sentence three reads: ...the earliest possible date, preferably so that it can be signed during the next meeting of leaders... (supplying dropped elements)

Column two, paragraph one, first sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...the joint draft treaty text being... (omitting "S.T.A.R.T.")

Column two, paragraph three, last sentence reads: ...aggregate number of warheads on ICBM's and SLBM's within the 6,000... (rewording for clarity)

Column two, paragraph five, sentence three reads: ...the [illegible]ited States: MX—10, Minuteman III—3, Minuteman [illegible]dent I—8, Trident II—8, and Poseidon—10;

[illegible]: SS-11—1, SS-13—1, SS-17—4, SS-18—10, [illegible]S-24—10, SS-25—1, SS-N-6—1, SS-N-8—1, [illegible]-1, SS-N-18—7, SS-N-23—4, SS-N-20—10.

[illegible]ocedures will be... (picking up sentence four, rewriting list of missiles to supply dropped "Trident II" and change order of Soviet missiles)

Same paragraph, sentence four reads: ...developed that enable verification [proverka] of the number... (supplying vernacular)

Page 17:

Column one, paragraph three, only sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...inspection to verify [proverka] the accuracy of... (supplying vernacular)

Column one, paragraph nine, only sentence reads: ...have been located (former declared facilities). (rewording to clarify, dropping editorial note)

Column one, paragraph eleven, sentence two reads: ...ban on telemetry encryption and would allow... (correcting word "encryption")

Column two, paragraph five, first sentence reads: ...and U.S. sides agreed to begin... (omitting word "have")

Column two, last paragraph, first sentence reads: ...also welcomed the agreement already achieved by the sides... (rewording)

Page 18:

Column one, paragraph two, last sentence reads: ...to the treaty.

M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan expressed support for... (picking up next paragraph, subbing names for titles)

Column one, last paragraph, first sentence reads: ...The two leaders discussed the importance... (substituting "two leaders" for titles)

Column two, paragraph four, only sentence reads: ...a thorough and frank [otkrovennyy] discussion of human... (substituting "frank" for "candid," supplying vernacular)

Column two, last paragraph, first sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...bilateral issues, M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan called for intensified... (substituting names for "the two leaders")

Same sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...search and rescue; collaboration in radio navigation systems; the delimitation of sea areas in the Chukchi and Bering Seas and the Arctic and Pacific Oceans; transportation and other areas.

The Soviet and U.S. leaders noted with satisfaction... (picking up next paragraph, rewording and supplying additional elements)

Page 19:

Column one, first paragraph, end of only sentence reads: ...of the Soviet-U.S. agreement on cooperation in the sphere of exploration of the world ocean.

The general secretary and the President took note of... (picking up next paragraph, first sentence, rewording, dropping subhead and supplying additional elements)

Column one, paragraph two, last sentence reads: ...in January 1988.

M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan reaffirmed the importance... (picking up next paragraph, first sentence, substituting names for "the two leaders");

Column one, paragraph four, first sentence reads: (of the environment, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. President approved a bilateral... (substituting titles for "the two leaders)

Same sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...and conservation of atmospheric ozone, and through... (substituting "atmospheric" for "stratospheric")

Same paragraph, last sentence reads: ...and environmental change.

M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan supported further cooperation... (picking up next paragraph, first sentence, substituting names for titles)

Column one, paragraph five, last sentence reads: ...fusion test reactor.

The general secretary and the President noted with satisfaction... (picking up next paragraph, first sentence, substituting titles for "the two leaders");

Same paragraph, only sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...the field of atomic energy, and expressed their... (substituting "atomic energy" for "nuclear reactor safety")

Column two, first paragraph, first sentence reads: The Soviet and U.S. leaders agreed to develop... (rewording titles)

Column two, paragraph two, only sentence reads: ...and maritime transportation.

M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan exchanged views on... (picking up next paragraph, first sentence, substituting names for "the two leaders")

Column two, paragraph three, last sentence reads: ...the region's environment.

The general secretary and the President... (substituting titles for "the two leaders")

Column two, paragraph five, first sentence reads: ...and economic relations. The general secretary and the President... (substituting titles for "they")

Same paragraph, end of second sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...and technical cooperation. The Soviet and U.S. leaders agreed that commercially... (picking up next sentence, substituting titles for "they.")

United States & Canada

Bush: Ratification Necessary 'Without Delay'

LD122343 Moscow TASS in English 1726 GMT 12 Dec 87

[Text] New York December 12 TASS—Touching upon the outcome of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Washington, U.S. Vice-President George Bush said that now it is necessary to ratify the treaty without delay. Speaking in an interview with the American ABC company. He stressed that the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan could be considered a success already at the time when the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles was signed.

According to the vice-president, the stands of the sides were brought somewhat closer in the field of strategic weapons in the course of the summit talks. George Bush said that this was not to mean that agreement could be got in a matter of a few days on all issues pertaining to the intercontinental ballistic missiles. Yet, progress was made and differences were reduced, Bush said. There is no doubt that Gorbachev and Reagan are right in saying that this summit meeting was, in their view, a success, Bush stressed. He expressed belief that when the President went to Moscow, agreements would be signed there including in the field of strategic weapons.

IZVESTIYA on Americans' Reaction to Treaty

PM161201 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondents A. Blinov and A. Shalnev dispatch: "Turn Toward New Thinking"]

[Text] Washington [dateline as published]—America is putting its glad rags on. This always happens before Christmas. The main streets of the big cities have been turned into Christmas tree markets which do business virtually 24 hours a day.

If you look at the Americans, their arms filled with boxes and packages, you think to yourself: They are concerned with nothing else at the moment, nothing interests them other than their list of New Year presents which they have to buy in time.

You come to realize, however, that this impression is deceptive. This is evident, for example, from the fact that the U.S. mass media are still intensively commenting on, analyzing, and assessing the events of the past week—the events of the third Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. Speeches by prominent politicians and the traditional conversations in front of the cameras which the leading television companies organize at the end of the week are concerned with summing up the results of this meeting.

In his speech at an election meeting in the state of Iowa U.S. Vice President George Bush noted that the Soviet-U.S. meeting marks the beginning of an era of "openness" in Soviet-U.S. dialogue. The meeting has been positively appraised by J. Wright, speaker of the House of Representatives, and R. Byrd, leader of the Democratic majority in Senate. R. Byrd voiced the hope in this connection that the U.S. Senate will be able to ratify the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles signed during the meeting without the need for any amendments that would "mutilate" it.

In an article published in the U.S. press U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz described the treaty on medium-range and shorter-range missiles as a "foundation stone" of future arms limitation talks. The treaty stipulates equal rights and limitations for the United States and the Soviet Union, he notes. It is important enough in itself although its significance goes much further—it serves as preparation for an agreement on strategic offensive weapons.

C. Powell, national security adviser to the President, has noted the importance of the treaty on medium-range and shorter-range missiles as it is the first step in reducing the two sides' nuclear arsenals and devotes particular attention to methods of monitoring fulfillment of the agreement. At the same time C. Powell admits that the two sides differ in their interpretation of the ABM Treaty requirements. This question will be the subject of future discussion.

The results of the summit meeting are the central theme of commentaries on U.S. television and in the press. They point out that broad circles of Americans gave a warm, enthusiastic reception to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, thereby demonstrating their keen interest in the successful outcome of the Soviet-U.S. talks. The Washington meeting has begun a new era in U.S.-Soviet relations; this is how P. Jennings, head of an ABC television news program, assessed the significance of the talks. WASHINGTON POST correspondents D. Hoffman and D. Oberdorfer described the meeting as "an important landmark in mutual political understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States."

The summit meeting was distinguished by its maturity and clear perception of the ways in which the two countries differ and the areas in which they can come closer together in their attempt to influence the course of history, according to an editorial in THE NEW YORK TIMES. The leaders of the two countries not only signed a treaty to eliminate Euromissiles, they also displayed courage by being able to make the necessary compromises, made important progress toward a treaty on significant cuts in strategic arms, and also held realistic talks on many other issues. The most important thing of all is that the meeting demonstrated the desire of the two countries' leaders to find ways to overcome the endless hostility.

An article by E. Goodman published in the same newspaper emphasizes that the import of the Washington meeting goes beyond the elimination of missiles envisaged by the treaty. Our ideas of what is essential to national security will also change with the elimination of an entire category of nuclear weapons. What would seem to be a hopelessly naive question—can the threat of war ultimately be removed?—arises once again. In 1946 A. Einstein remarked that the atom bomb "has changed everything except our way of thinking." The results of the 1987 summit meeting inspire the hope that we have possibly at last begun to change our way of thinking, E. Goodman writes.

Unfortunately, however, the appearance of the rudiments of new thinking does not suit some conservative U.S. politicans. According to newspaper reports, former Defense Secretary C. Weinberger has voiced "concern" that broad circles of the American public have unequivocally expressed their desire to further improve Soviet-U.S. relations. "Washington has gone mad"—this, according to the press, is how Weinberger described Americans' demonstration of their feelings of friendship toward the Soviet delegation.

At a news conference at the American Institute of Enterprise R. Perle, Weinberger's former assistant who was responsible for disarmament issues in the Pentagon until recently, expressed his "disappointment" that precisely this subject was the central issue on the agenda of the meeting. In his opinion, it would have been better for the United States if the White House had laid the emphasis on overtly confrontational issues. R. Perle and those who think like him have recommended to the Senate—where, as you well know, there is a group of people opposed to the treaty on medium-range and shorter-range missiles—"not to be in too much of a hurry" to ratify the treaty.

"Advice" like this clearly does not accord with the opinion of most Americans. This is shown by the results of public opinion polls conducted by the ABC television company. According to ABC's data, before the summit meeting 52% of Americans were in support of the treaty on medium-range and shorter-range missiles. After the meeting the treaty was approved of by 71% of the respondents. A total of 57% of Americans supported the idea of cutting the two countries' strategic offensive arsenals by half and only 11% did not agree with this.

Well, the best thing is to go out on the street and actually talk with passersby to understand that the summit meeting has made a serious impression on Americans, both intellectually and spiritually. Opinions are sometimes mutually exclusive, however. For example, Bob Shaydlman [name as published] from New York State says he is sure that the world has become a safer place as a result of the meeting, while Sandy Dunlop from South Dakota thinks differently: The signing of the treaty means nothing as yet as it still has to get through the Senate, and until the Senate approves the treaty the weapons will remain—and so the danger posed by these weapons will also remain. Elizabeth Sperry from Massachusetts says she does not feel completely safe but that she feels far safer than before, when there was no treaty. The treaty is the beginning.

We looked for the small town of Jastes [name as published] on a map of North Carolina. It is so small, so unremarkable that it seems to be lost, cut off from the state and the rest of America. We had difficulty getting through on the telephone. Less than 100 people live in this small town and almost all of them were out at work in the fields or in nearby factories.

"Things are always like this here," said the owner of a small food store who we got through to on the telephone eventually. "People are always working. There is no time to do anything else. Do we know about what has been happening in Washington? Of course we do. We may be unaware of other things but we must know about this...."

This is obviously the common denominator: No one is indifferent. This means a great deal in the United States.

Charikov on U.S. Reactions, Media Role

LD131211 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 12 Dec 87

[Igor Charikov commentary]

[Text] Soon after the conclusion of the visit to the United States by the Soviet leader and of his news conference, and also after President Reagan's television address, the ABC television company carried out an opinion poll on the results of the talks which were held and the prospects for Soviet-U.S. agreements. Our commentator Igor Charikov is at the microphone:

[Charikov] The results of this survey reflected perfectly reliably the views of Americans on what happened at the Soviet-U.S. talks during these December days and on what the leaders of the two countries will have to do in the future. The overwhelming majority of those questioned spoke in support of the signed Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range missiles; 57% of a further continuation of the negotiations on cutting strategic arsenals by half. At the same time, 32%—that is, almost one third of those questioned—replied that they did not have a definite view on this matter, and 11% spoke out against.

Of course, it is gratifying to realize that such a large number of Americans—generalizing the results of the survey, of course—support the continuation of Soviet-U.S. dialogue, the aim of which consists of taking the next step in the sphere of disarmament. But I think that it is worthwhile also to ponder the fact that a fairly considerable proportion of the citizens of the United States remained apathetic. We sometimes devote our main attention to those processes or events which coincide with our point of view and overlook those which,

albeit to an insignificant degree, contradict it. I am thinking of those very same 32% who did not express a view and the 11% who oppose strategic arms limitation. It turns out that not all Americans—far from all of them—realize the danger contained in nuclear arms. Why do they not realize it?

Before trying to answer that question, I shall cite another figure, which makes one prick up one's ears much more: to the question from the U.S. weekly NEWSWEEK, posed to 1,017 Americans on the eve of the summit meeting: Do you consider the complete elimination of nuclear weapons possible, 61% of those questioned answered no. The answer must be found in the fact that the frame of mind of Americans who are not experienced in politics and have difficulty imagining what medium-range, shorter-range and ballistic missiles are, is shaped almost totally through information in the press and on television and radio. Far from always do they describe objectively either the essence of the issue or the Soviet position, exaggerating some dangers and playing down others. How much blatant anti-Sovietism was splashed across the television screens of the United States and the pages of newspapers and magazines long before the third Soviet-U.S. summit meeting! So, I think that the key to the statistics which I cited above lies precisely in how, and perhaps to what purpose, highly important issues of international politics are presented to Americans by the mass media.

At his news conference in Washington, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said, addressing the newsmen: People want a better life, people want better understanding, people want to mix together and to be friends; but how much instigation to completely different things do we have through the press! The mass media also need to restructure themselves and to master new thinking.

Korzin Hits Nitze Remarks on Military Balance

LD152034 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 15 Dec 87

[From "The World Today" program presented by Valeriy Korzin]

[Text] Addressing editors of U.S. regional television studios and newspapers Ronald Reagan said, when the signing of the treaty was mentioned: I am convinced that your—here he had in mind the publishers he was meeting—reporting of the latest summit meeting is among the best information materials in many years to have been given to the American people and to our allies. After his meetings with the Soviet leader, the U.S. President even made a discovery all of his own, and I quote: One of the characteristic features of the Russian people is in the fact that Russians are very similar to us Americans in their sense of humor and cordiality.

During the first post-summit news conference, when Reagan was asked: Mr President, who won in this round of talks? He replied: I think that the peoples of both countries have won.

However, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev correctly stated during his television speech yesterday: When old views are being shattered, resistance inevitably grows on the part of those who link their political and material well-being with them. Well, to give an example, how are we to assess what Paul Nitze, special arms control adviser to the President and the U.S. secretary of state, has said? According to him, the United States has so restored its military might over the past few years that currently it is, allegedly, looking down on the USSR from the viewpoint of military balance.

Addressing Foreign Policy Association members in New York, Nitze called for continuing the policy from a position of force with regard to the USSR. So much for words. This is what is happening in deed: The first test of the elements of the guidance and control system for the Star Wars program, already involving the use of a real ICBM, has taken place in the United States. This missile was launched from the Vandenberg USAF base and for the duration of its half hour flight, a special device for identifying real and decoy targets with the aid of special ground-based and air-based sensors analyzed its trajectory.

The DEFENSE NEWS paper, close to the Pentagon, has just reported that next year the U.S. Defense Department plans to carry out another four similar tests—so, as you can see, the work on SDI, on the Star Wars program, is continuing. It is not ruled out that this program will be beefed up in the nearest future by a mini Star Wars program—the tactical defense initiative on which Israel has already been working for some years now.

11 Dec U.S. Trident-2 Missile Test Reported

LD121456 Moscow TASS in English 1414 GMT 12 Dec 87

[Text] New York December 12 TASS—The Pentagon tested on Friday a new intercontinental ballistic missile Trident-2. A three-stage missile was launched from Cape Canaveral, Florida, and hit a target in the Atlantic Ocean with its dummy warheads.

Trident-2 is designed for equipping nuclear powered submarines, in each of which it is planned to install 24 missiles. The test conducted on Friday was the eighth out of the 20 planned launchings. After them it is also planned to carry out experimental launchings of missiles of submarines in a submerged state. As the ASSOCIATED PRESS agency reported, the Pentagon intends to complete the phasing in of submarines with "Trident-2" missiles by the end of 1989.

Further on Space Cooperation Protocol
LD131420 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 12 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] In Moscow scientists of the USSR and the United States have signed the first protocol on working parties for exploring the solar system.

[S. Slipchenko—identified by caption] No one expected so many journalists at the scientists' final meeting. The interest of the press might be explained by the fact that from this day every grandiose project for the exploration of Mars, Venus, other planets of the solar system, comets, and planetary matter will be jointly conducted by Soviet and U.S. scientists. Before the protocol was signed the leader of the delegation, Valeriy Leonidovich Barsukov, handed over to the U.S.—by now—partners a full set of 27 charts of the surface of Venus made by Soviet interplanetary stations.

The NASA representative, Dr Keller, handing over to the Soviet side photographs of the earth taken by U.S. satellites, said: We are exploring all the planets of the solar system. But the main and most important thing for us is the earth. I would like to present you with this book; if you open it on page 300 you will find your country there, the Soviet Union.

Today, cooperation on earth and for the earth is vital. The U.S. scientists said they are convinced of that. The signing of this protocol, after a 6-year break, opens up new possibilities for the exploration of space and the planets of the solar system.

Now the meetings of the working parties will become permanent and scientists of the Soviet Union and the United States are hoping for work which will lead to the creation of joint space equipment and apparatus. The ways can be different but the objective that the countries have is the same: to deliver martian soil to earth by the year 2000, while early next ce[illegible]y man should set foot on the surface of Mars.

Soviet, U.S. Academics Hold Roundtable
LD142323 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1725 GMT 14 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, 14 Dec (TASS)—TASS correspondent Viktor Lebedev reports: The first Soviet-U.S. "roun[illegible]t-able" on the development problems in their economies has opened today in the Soviet capital. Participating in its work are, on the U.S. side, prominent scientists and economists from Brooklyn and Harvard Universities; leaders and specialists from "Planecon Inc", which deals with studies of the Soviet and East European economies. The Soviet side is represented by Academician Abel Aganbegyan, Tatyana Zaslavskaya, Leonid Abalkin, Nikolay Petrakov, corresponding members of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and many leading scientists and economists.

Opening the meeting, Academician Aganbegyan briefed the U.S. colleagues on successes and problems in the restructuring under way in the Soviet Union, and stressed the intensification of the social orientation of economic development, which is aimed at increasing the Soviet people's standard of living. He noted that the Soviet standard of living still lags behind the country's industrial might.

The U.S. economists stressed that the progress of economic restructuring in the USSR is attentatively followed and studied in the United States. Professor E.A. Hewitt pointed out that the majority of U.S. Sovietologists, even those who were previously skeptical about the success of the reform, now think it will be realized, although a difficult battle lies ahead for its implementation.

The first day of the work of the "roundtable" was held in a businesslike and benevolent atmosphere, with useful and frank discussions on all aspects of restructuring.

After 2 days in Moscow, the U.S. participants will visit Riga, the capital of Soviet Estonia, where they will meet Latvian economists and familiarize themselves with the republic. It was decided that such meetings between Soviet and U.S. economists will become annual ones. The next one will take place in 1988 in the United States and will be dedicated to U.S. economic problems.

U.S., Israel Sign Military Cooperation Agreement
LD150933 Moscow TASS in English 0830 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 15 TASS—U.S. Defense Secretary Frank Carlucci and his Israeli counterpart Yitzhaq Rabin signed in Washington last Monday an American-Israeli military cooperation agreement which actually ensures to Israeli arms manufacturing companies unlimited access to the U.S. market. The agreement gives Israeli firms equal right with U.S. and NATO concerns to vie for the Pentagon's orders.

Thus, one more step was made in the stepping up of military cooperation between Tel Aviv and Washington. The U.S. defense secretary assured Rabin that despite serious budget problems facing the U.S., its military assistance to Israel would remain on the present level and would not be reduced. In the past fascal year U.S. military assistance to Israel stood at 1.8 billion dollars. In 1986 the U.S. purchased from Israeli arms manufacturing firms 205 million dollars worth of weapons. And agreement on the partial financing by Washington of a so-called "mini-Star Wars" program of Israel is expected to be signed during the current visit to the U.S. of the

Israeli defense minister. Within the framework of the program Tel Aviv is developing a system of defense against tactical nuclear missiles.

Shabayev on 'Sinister Meaning'

LD161903 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1414 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, 16 Dec (TASS)—TASS Political Observer Boris Shabayev writes:

There is no sound of the thunder of propagandist drums on the occasion of the signing of the U.S.-Israeli "memorandum on mutual understanding", either in Washington or in Tel Aviv. One must assume that the "strategic allies" have weighty grounds for not particularly advertizing this qualitatively new step in the expansion of military cooperation. This is precisely a qualitative matter since from now on all the advantages and privileges in the sphere of both the development and the creation of various weapons systems jointly with the United States, and the purchasing of U.S. military hardware, are being extended to Israel. To put it simply, it will now be cheaper for Tel Aviv to upgrade the Israeli military machine, and its access to the most modern means of destruction is being expanded.

The anti-Arab tendency of this agreement is so obvious that no detailed commentaries are required. However, this traditional feature of the U.S.-Israeli alliance is by no means the be-all and end-all of the new "memorandum".

Washington has long since resorted to Israel's services as its agent for military supplies in those cases when the United States itself dare not risk operating openly. Among Tel Aviv's regular clients are the racist Pretoria regime and the Chilean junta, South Korea and Paraguay, the Nicaraguan contras and the antigovernment terrorist bands of UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] in Angola and the National Resistance forces in Mozambique.

Israel has made a solid contribution to the creation of South Africa's powerful military machine which serves, as the London MIDDLE EAST INTERNATIONAL magazine points out, "both for external aggression, and for the suppression of the ever more recalcitrant black majority within the country". Up to 45% of the cost of Israel's export in weapons, the handing over of military technology, and assistance in the development of the military industry is allocated to Pretoria.

Among the main recipients of Israeli weapons are the repressive regimes in Latin America. Sanctioned by Washington, Israel has sold U.S. weapons here, receiving the latest models in exchange. The man behind this combination—one David Kimche who took over the post of general director of the Israeli Foreign Ministry in the role of "private trader" in arms—became so successful in these operations that he was the central figure in Tel Aviv's participation in the "Iran-contras" affair.

In light of these facts, the "memorandum" signed in Washington acquires a particularly sinister meaning. There is every reason to believe that one of its designs is to make more active use of the Israeli channel for supplying Washington's most odious clients with more up-to-date and lethal weapons which also means kindling regional conflicts.

U.S. Journal Prints Gorbachev GOSR Speech

LD152338 Moscow TASS in English 2335 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] New York December 16 TASS—In its January issue the journal FOREIGN AFFAIRS, a monthly on world politics and international relations which is influential in the USA, printed in the section "Documents" the report by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the joint gala meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, devoted to the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Moscow TV Attacks U.S. on Human Rights

LD101831 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0400 GMT 10 Dec 87

[From the "90 Minutes" program]

[Text] Today is 10 December and the world is marking Human Rights Day, so allow me to call your attention to this event. At the current Soviet-U.S. summit both Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan have already touched upon the theme of human rights more than once in their speeches. This is natural as the problem of human rights is of concern both to us and to the Americans, because people want to live in a world where everyone is granted the right of life, freedom and happiness, and of course other human rights. These are the words of our general secretary.

The events now taking place in Washington are outstanding for Soviet-U.S. and international relations. The hands of the clock portending the nuclear annihilation of our civilization have been slowed. This is the main thing. To achieve this for the salvation of the earth we shall continue our joint struggle. However, our social systems, our ways of life, and our views, for example our views on the problem of human rights, differ very greatly and one cannot avoid saying this today on Human Rights Day.

The United States talks about rights more than anyone else, but it has not ratified 30 of the 40 existing international treaties and conventions on human rights. Why, for example, does the United States forbid entry to such outstanding writers and public figures as, for example,

Gabriel Garcia Marquez, Jorge Amado, (Abe Cobo), and almost 50,000 other citizens from various countries? Entry to the United States is forbidden to them for ideological motives.

We well remember the words of Andrew Young, former permanent representative of the United States to the United Nations, to the effect that there were hundreds and perhaps thousands of political prisoners in the United States. By the way, according to data of the Prisoners of Conscience public organisation, U.S. prisons hold over 11,000 prisoners. The 3 million homeless and the 8 million unemployed Americans are also people; what about their rights? Can death sentences be passed on children? In a civilized country this is not done. But there have been 32 such cases in the United States and some of those who have been sentenced to death were barely 10 years old. Every inhabitant of a civilized country should be able to read and write; that is also his right. It is very strange to hear that in the United States, with its wealth and its fine achievements by scientists and cultural figures, there are millions of illiterate people. Thirteen percent of the whole adult U.S. population is illiterate.

All of this is surely far from being the best manifestation of American freedoms and today on Human Rights Day we are obliged to remember this.

Senate Approves Government Spending Bill

LD131559 Moscow TASS in English 1255 GMT 13 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 13 TASS—TASS correspondent Oleg Polyakovskiy reports:

At long last, the U.S. Senate approved a bill on government spending at 606 billion dollars for the current fiscal year which started on October 1. It was adopted nearly one and a half months later, after an unprecedented 17-hour conclusive debate. Up to this time government activities were financed on the basis of a resolution on provisional allocation of funds.

Disputes in the Senate were especially dramatic on appropriations of funds to Nicaraguan contras whom senators decided to allocate nine million dollars up to the end of February, making a reservation that money could be used only for supplies of food, medicines, clothing and other so-called humane aid. The upper chamber of the U.S. Congress decided to leave open the question on aid to contras for the following months.

The House of Representatives did not envisage any aid at all to contras in its version of the bill. Now the question will be resolved by the House-Senate conference committee which will have to remove also many other differences in the two versions of the bill. After a compromise bill is drafted, it will be approved by Congress and sent for the President's signature.

U.S. Minesweepers to Use Robots in Gulf

LD101552 Moscow TASS in English 0743 GMT 10 Dec 87

[Text] New York December 10 TASS—U.S. minesweepers in the Gulf are to get underwater robots that will substantially broaden their possibilities to detect and indentify anchored mines, THE NEW YORK TIMES reported, saying the systems would be complete with color television cameras and sonars.

U.S. naval ships used identical systems when searching for the debris of the space shuttle Challenger which exploded over the ocean off Florida.

Mine-sweepers from European countries allied with the United States are currently using similar robots in the Gulf.

China

Beijing Commentator Discusses INF Treaty

OW161253 Beijing in Russian to the USSR 1800 GMT 14 Dec 87

["International News Review" program]

[Text] [Announcer] The Soviet-U.S. summit in Washington has been widely commented on by the world public. In today's "International News Review" program we will ask our commentator Hung Bo to discuss this issue.

[Hung Bo] The result of the summit meeting in Washington did not reach the expectations of the people. A long-worked-on agreement on the elimination of medium and short-range missiles was signed. However, no breakthrough on the key question was achieved, that is, the reduction of strategic nuclear weapons and other related strategic defensive weapons. Progress has only been achieved in the area of establishing a limit on strategic nuclear weapons.

At the Reykjavik summit meeting last year, both sides have already agreed to reduce strategic nuclear arms by 50%. At the present Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, the American side agreed to the proposal to limit the number of long-range missiles launched from submarines, and both sides reached agreement on verification measures. But the question that, after the 50% reduction of strategic nuclear arms there still remain a number of difficult questions pertaining to the reduction of the balance of different types of long-range missiles, has not been resolved. Because of this, both sides feel the need for a (?serious) breakthrough on the reduction of strategic arms. The Soviet Union has always demanded the reduction of the strategic arms be tied to limitations being placed on the U.S. SDI program. At the present meeting, Gorbachev expressed his intention not to discuss this program with Reagan. American observers view this statement by Gorbachev as the abandonment by the Soviet Union of its original position on this issue. At the

same time, we must keep in mind that Gorbachev spoke about the need for the United States to strictly abide by the 1972 ABM Treaty. Before the beginning of the summit we raised the question of whether they would reach a compromise on the ABM issue. This question continues to attract the attention of the people.

The results of the summit show that both parties have avoided the repetition of the Reykjavik practice and have remained true to their opinions.

It has been reported that the leaders of the two countries said at the summit meeting that their representatives at the Geneva talks will try for an agreement that would allow both sides, while abiding by the treaty, to conduct research permissible by the treaty to development and test space weapons. Since the United States chooses to interpret this treaty broadly — taking the position that according to the treaty space weapons can be produced for experimental purposes — then I think that Reagan will continue to act in accordance with his understanding of the treaty.

After Gorbachev departed Washington, Reagan, in a television appearance to the nation stated unambiguously that the United States will continue to work on SDI. He also said that should this arms system be deployable, then the United States will indeed deploy it.

Gorbachev, at the press conference prior to his departure from Washington, emphasized once again his position against the SDI program. Therefore, it is not difficult to understand the claim that although the summit was successful, disagreements between the leaders still exist. I think that these differences are not limited only to the area of arms control but also on matters of regional questions.

One of the regional issues that continues to attract attention is the Afghan question. Gorbachev announced that the Soviet Union will withdraw its forces from Afghanistan within 12 months or perhaps even sooner. At the same time, he demanded of the United States that it cease rendering help to the Afghan resistance forces from the moment the USSR begins withdrawing its forces from the country.

Under the present conditions, when there is a growing number of people in the Soviet Union demanding the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, the world community is naturally interested in how the Soviet authorities will act in the future.

However, let us return to the topic under discussion: I agree that the summit had achieved a certain progress. After the signing of the INF Treaty, both Gorbachev and Reagan have stressed, on numerous occasions, the historic significance of this treaty. Presently, the slowing of the arms race and the lowering of international tension represents the universal aspiration of the peoples of the world. Therefore, the Soviet Union and the United States must go forward by taking the second and the third steps. Failing that, the treaty on the elimination of the medium range missiles will lose what limited significance it has.

In the joint statement released after the end of the Washington meeting, both sides expressed their desire, in the near future, to reach an agreement on a 50% reduction of strategic weapons. Perhaps this could be achieved in time for the signature of the two leaders at next year's summit in Moscow. However, this new agreement is still very much up in the air, since there are differences in the composition of nuclear weapons of the two sides and the difficulties of verification have not been resolved. Added to this is the fact that the positions of the parties on the question of strategic defense, remains diametrically at variance.

Certainly, it must be said that the people of the world expect and will welcome such an agreement. Moreover, they will watch with interest just how long the atmosphere, generated by the third meeting, will last, and whether the United States and the Soviet Union will be prepared to undertake new, even greater steps on the path of nuclear disarmament.

U.S. Position Toward Xizang Criticized

OW161337 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0300 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Shakov commentary]

[Text] Commenting on an amendment adopted by the U.S.Congress on China's violation of human rights in Xizang, RENMIN RIBAO said that this was a gross interference in China's internal affairs and an open vilification of the Chinese Government and people. The Chinese people, the paper stressed, have never elected U.S congressmen and, of course, never given them any authority to deal with issues that are solely China's internal affairs. Our station commentator Shakov has the following comments on this:

The U.S. authorities acknowledge only in words that Xizang is an inalienable part of China. From the viewpoint of international law and the UN Charter, it cannot be considered permissible to discuss the situation of a locality belonging to another sovereign country. In particular, it is impermissible for U.S. congressmen to discuss the human rights situation in Xizang on the basis of forged, untrue information, which does not reflect the real facts.

U.S. Congress activities regarding human rights have encroached upon the sovereignty of many countries in Asia, especially those choosing to take the road of independent development. At different times and on different pretexts, U.S. congressmen have raised the issues on violation of human rights in India, Afghanistan, Vietnam, Cambodia, and other countries. There is a rule: The more the U.S. ruling clique is dissatisfied

with an Asian country's policy, the more serious violation of human rights they will discover in that country. Conversely, the human rights problems in those countries that are Washington followers will in no way worry the United States. This concerns the U.S. relations with South Korea, Pakistan, and a number of other countries, whose rulers invariably fawn upon their master on the other side of the ocean with unswerving loyalty.

RENMIN RIBAO pointed this out sharply. It said: U.S. congressmen have an ulterior motive when talking profusely about protecting human rights. Moreover, they confuse black and white. In the past when the Xizang people were suffering from bitter exploitation, these human rights protectors did not utter a single word. Now that the Xizang people have gained the power to act as the masters of their country and are engaged in building up a new life, Washington is shouting itself hoarse to call for protection of human rights in Xizang. Such a line cannot help to improve the political climate in the Asia-Pacific region. Primarily, it indicates that the U.S. ruling clique refuses to give up its style as an overlord and has not abondoned its attempt to unreasonably interfere in the internal affirs of other sovereign countries.

U.S. Advisor Briefs PRC Officials on Summit

LD151330 Moscow Tass in English 1313 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Beijing December 15 TASS—A meeting took place here between Foreign Minister of the Chinese People's Republic Wu Xueqian and Edward Rowny, special advisor to the President and secretary of state on arms control matters, who arrived in Beijing to brief the leadership of China on the results of the Soviet-US summit meeting.

The news agency XINHUA reported that Rowny arrived in Beijing last night and already met early today with Qian Jichen, deputy foreign minister of the Chinese People's Republic.

S&T Cooperative Agreements To Be Signed

OW161031 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1500 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Comrade (Kharshenov), responsible person of the Soviet State Committee for Science and Technology, said in an interview with our reporter that the Soviet Union and China are planning to sign 12 long-term agreements in 1988 for cooperation in various fields of science and technology.

A few days ago, (Kharshenov) returned from China, where he attended the second meeting of a standing subcommittee for Soviet-Chinese cooperation in science and technology. The meeting summed up the cooperative work of Soviet and Chinese scientists and specialists in 1987, approved the namelists of members of delegations to be exchanged next year, and discussed the establishment of direct contacts between Soviet and Chinese science units along the border of the two countries. In addition, the two sides reached agreement on conducting science-and-technology day activities in Beijing and Moscow to be attended by scientists and technicians in various fields from the two countries. When the Soviet Science and Technology Day is held in China, there will be a Soviet exhibition, which is slated to open on 7 November 1988 in Beijing.

Joint Fishery Cooperation Pact Signed

LD141141 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 14 Dec 87

[Text] A meeting of specialists from the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China ended today in Tashkent with the adoption of a long-term program for cooperation in the fields of fish-breeding and fishing. It envisages exchange of technologies and materials, and the organization of joint ichthyological research and sea and inland fishing. It is planned to set up joint fish-breeding enterprises on the Amur and the Ussuri.

Talks Held on Medical Cooperation

OW161329 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] The Soviet Union and China began talks on medical cooperation in Moscow. The two sides will decide through consultation about scientific research subjects and some major medical work. The medical workers of the two countries will cooperate in treatment and prevention of various kinds of heart disease and cancer, micro-ophthalmological surgery, acupuncture, herb medicine, and environmental sanitation.

During its visit in the Soviet Union, the delegation from the Chinese Ministry of Public Health will familiarize itself with the achievements of Soviet cardiologists and ophthalmologists, and visit some medical colleges, surgical centers, and woman and child care centers.

Northeast Asia

Adamishin Briefs Japanese on INF Treaty

LD171117 Moscow TASS in English 1106 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Tokyo December 17 TASS—Anatoliy Adamishin, a deputy foreign minister of the USSR who was staying here as a special representative of the Soviet leadership, met on December 15 through 17 with Japanese Foreign Minister Sosuke Uno and his first deputy Rehey Murata and a group of senior officials from the Foreign Ministry.

The Japanese side was briefed in detail upon the Soviet view of the results of Washington talks held by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Hope was expressed that Japan would play a constructive role in efforts to ensure a further turn from confrontation to cooperation in international affairs.

The exchange of opinions touched upon some issues of bilateral relations as well.

Uno said Japan welcomed the Treaty Eliminating all Soviet and U.S. Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles as a first step to reducing nuclear weapons and wished success to the USSR and the United States along that path, first of all as regards strategic offensive arms.

A conversation was held also with the leaders of the association of Japanese MP's for world disarmament, which includes representatives of all political parties in Japan.

Takeshita Hails INF Accord

LD161257 Moscow TASS in English 1235 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Manila December 16 TASS—The Soviet-American Treaty on the Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles signed at the summit meeting in Washington is a very important factor of maintaining international peace, including in Asia, said Prime Minister of Japan Noboru Takeshita.

Replying to a TASS correspondent's question at a press conference held here today, the head of the Japanese Government underlined that his country sincerely welcomed the agreement reached, the progress in relations between the USSR and the United States. This document gives one a sense of satisfaction, makes one hopeful for further steps in the sphere of reduction of stratigic nuclear armaments and conventional weapons, and also for settlement of regional conflicts, said Noboru Takeshita.

Japan's Fishing Talks Continue; Few Results

LD162124 Moscow TASS in English 2003 GMT 16 dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 16 TASS—A session of the Soviet Japanese commission on fisheries, currently meeting in Moscow, has agreed on many items of the agenda. Yet, the negotiations are being dragged due to differences on some points, the USSR Ministry of Fisheries has announced.

The session, discussing the terms of mutual fishing in the Soviet and Japanese 200-mile economic zones in 1988, has reached an agreement in principle on fishing areas, deadlines and catch quotas. The sides agreed that Soviet and Japanese fishermen would be allowed to catch free-of-charge up to 200,000 tons of fish in each other's economic zones. In view of repeated violation of fishing regulations committed by Japanese vessels in areas adjacent to the Soviet coast this year, the session identified measures of increased control over their operation.

At the same time some issues remain unresolved. Despite the existing practice, the Japanese side is refusing to allow Soviet vessels, engaged in fishing on a reciprocal basis, to call at one of the Japanese ports for replenishing food stocks and for crews' recreation. The absence of this opportunity would inevitably reduce the efficiency of operations by the Soviet fishing fleet.

There are differences over Japan's compensation for an additional 100,000 ton quota on catching fish near the Soviet coast, which the Soviet Union granted unilaterally on a licence basis, asking 2.3 billion yen as compensation. In a bid to make the talks successful, the figure was later reduced to 1.984 billion yen.

Another point at issue are the existing trade barriers. Discriminating restrictions on bringing into Japan fish and fish products from the Soviet Union have become a stumbling block in expanding commercial ties between Soviet fishing organisations and Japanese firms interested in such cooperation.

At present, Soviet fishermen are allowed to deliver only small consignments of fresh Alaska Pollack to Japan. Such restrictions, which do not spread on other countries, are restraining the development of bilateral cooperation in fisheries, including the setting up of joint ventures.

U.S. Pressures Japan on Cocom Restictions

LD160934 Moscow TASS in English 0924 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Tokyo December 16 TASS—TASS correspondent Vasiliy Golovnin reports:

In addition to the existing discriminatory lists of 'goods banned for export' the U.S. is demanding that Japan impose new tough restructions on the exchange of computer programs and even scientific ideas with third countries. According to the newspaper NIHON KEIZAI, Washington wants to get a written statement from Japan pledging to take such measures which would be obviously directed against socialist and some developing countries.

Formally the United States demands the imposing of restructions only on the exchange of so-called dual-purpose technology which, in the opinion of the U.S. Administration, can be used both for civilian and military purposes. However, practically all the modern scientific developments fall within this category, including those connected with computer facilities, new materials, superconductivity and so on.

Thus, the point at issue is the expanding of the scope of a discriminatory regime imposed by the Coordinating Committee on Export Controls (Cocom) which includes Japan and most of the NATO countries. Earlier this year Tokyo decided under Washington's pressure to toughen

punishment for the so-called "violation" of Cocom instructions. Businessmen accused of not following them now face the threat of imprisonment for up to five years.

However, according to the press, new demands of Washington were met in Tokyo without much enthusiasm, to put it mildly. The thing is that they deal a blow at a major part of Japanese exports and undermine the right of the country to its scientific developments and other "intellectual property". And still, a special group of Pentagon experts will arrive here next January to tackle the problem of dual-purpose technology, KYODO TSUSHIN reports.

USSR-Japan Trade Association Session Begins

PM161651 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[D. Kosyrev report: "Soviet-Japanese Trade Association in Session"]

[Text] AYAST is the acronym for the Soviet-Japanese Trade Association. The ninth conference of the trade association and of representatives of the USSR Foreign Trade Ministry began at the Soviet International Trade Center in Moscow 15 December.

The following facts and figures were heard at the first session. This year marked the 20th anniversary of the creation of AYAST, which unites 60 Japanese trade and production firms and cooperatives. The volume of their trade with Soviet organizations has now reached 300 million dollars. For the first time in the history of relations between our two countries a joint enterprise has been set up—"Igirma-Tairiku" [name as published]—for the production of sawn timber, whose commissioning is planned for next April. Incidentally, the decision to set it up was adopted at the previous AYAST conference.

In all, 15 joint enterprises have been set up between the USSR and capitalist countries, and there will be far more of them. However, for two neighboring states such as Japan and the USSR the present volume of business ties is plainly not great.

In his speech D. Ibata, president of the Tairiku Trading Company, stated: Unfortunately, progress is not to be observed in our countries' political and economic relations, and a drop in overall commodity turnover is in evidence. There is also the influence of Cocom's restrictive policy, which puts a stick between the spokes in the wheel of trade with socialist countries. It is hard to look with optimism to the future, the president observed, but this is precisely why efforts must be made to increase the volume of ties somewhat.

Reportage on ROK Presidential Election

U.S Neutrality Questioned

SK170907 Moscow International Service in Korean 0930 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] South Korean presidential elections will be held tomorrow. An acute political struggle is currently being waged in this country. Under these circumstances, the United States has officially declared that it will not send its representatives to Seoul until 16 December in order not to disturb the democratic process in this country. In regard to this, our station commentator (Aleksandr Gosteb) says the following:

There are doubts about the sincerity of the remarks by U.S. officials. The events which have taken place in the southern half of the Korean peninsula over the past 40 years prove this.

From the beginning, Washington's attitude toward South Korea has never changed since it installed Syngman Rhee, nurtured by the Americans, in the post of South Korea's president by supporting him with guns and bayonets.

Currently, there is no need for the U.S. Administration to send its special envoy to South Korea to influence South Korean events. Its military headquarters, espionage agency, and business organizations are there. They are closely linked with those in South Korean power circles and exercise direct influence over them.

However, the most fundamental thing is the presence of more than 40,000 troops equipped with the most modern weapons, including nuclear missiles.

The propaganda agencies of the Pentagon contend that the presence of Americans in South Korea is to defend the country from the threat of a so-called southward invasion, not to interfere in its internal affairs.

It is noteworthy that the South Korean troops are under the direct control of a U.S. general. It is a phenomenon which can be seen only in South Korea, that the troops of a country are under the control of a foreign general. The general is the commander of the U.S. forces in South Korea and of the U.S.-South Korean Combined Forces Command.

Let us look back the incident in 1980 when the South Korean people rose up against the new dictator, Chon Tu-hwan, and the entire area of South Korea was filled with inhignation.

At that time, U.S. President Carter said that defending South Korea from the threat of communism was more important than achieving democracy there. With Washington's tacit (?consent), Kwangju citizens were suppressed.

Of course, the era is changing, but it would be very naive for one to think that the United States truly stands neutral in the South Korean presidential elections.

From a political and military point of view, Washington urgently desires that a dictatorship will continue in South Korea as long as possible. This is because it can maintain South Korea as a (?military base) most effectively only when the dictatorial regime remains in South Korea.

At a time when a movement is widely carried out to establish a (?nuclear-free zone) in the Asian and Pacific region and to eliminate mass-destruction weapons from that area, South Korea remains as the only place where the Pentagon has deployed nuclear weapons, including (?nuclear) missiles.

For the United States, abandoning its (?bases) in South Korea is (?unthinkable). It is certain that the United States will continue to interfere in the internal affairs of the Korean people even after the elections.

The South Korean people will have to continue to struggle for (?genuine) freedom and democracy.

U.S. Trying to Secure Presence

LD162233 Moscow TASS in English 1811 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Tokyo December 16 TASS—Hundreds of students and residents of Kwangju held a demonstration of protest against the rigging of the election returns. Units of police sent to disperse the demonstration used teargas.

Kim Tae-chung came out with the statement in which he emphasized that numerous cases of rigging the election returns took place during the election. Kim Yong-sam, in his turn, warned that falsification of the election returns is fraught with "serious consequences". The Japanese newspaper "YOMIURI" does not preclude the possibility of the repetition in South Korea of such events as took place in Kwangju in may 1980 when an uprising against Chon Tu-hwan's dictatorship broke out. According to some data, over 2,000 people were killed when the uprising was being suppressed.

The KYODO Tsushin news agency reports that U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of State William Clark arrived in Seoul to observe the situation that will shape after the elections. During a four-day stay in South Korea he will hold talks with Foreign minister Choe Kwang-su and other representatives of the government on question of the further development of Washington-Seoul relations. Local observers connect the visit of the U.S. emissary with the striving of the Reagan Administration to prevent the consequences of the elections calling in question the United States presence in the South of the Korean peninsula where a nearly 40-thousand strong contingent of the Pentagon is deployed.

Moscow TV on Election

OW170837 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0700 GMT 16 Dec 87

[From the World Today program, presented by Valeriy Korzin]

[Text] The following report was filmed in South Korea. Tomorrow the population of South Korea will be electing the president of the country. The video report we have received shows the preelection situation. This is the last press conference of a retired general, No Tae-u, the presidential candidate of the ruling party. He is supported by big capital and the Army. The opposition party candidates hold meetings as well. One of them, Kim Tae-chung, has been trying to prove during the whole preelection campaign that the government candidate under no circumstances can be the head of the state, because he was an active participant in the 1970 military coup and a closest associate of dictator Chon Tu-hwan during the subsequent years. Kim Tae-chung is thought to be supported, first of all, by the poorest strata of population of cities, as well as by liberal public organizations. The so called middle class, moderate antigovernment circles and democratically-minded military support another opposition leader, Kim Yong-sam. Five candidates in all will participate in the elections. It is difficult to say now what is the actual correlation of their strength, because no opinion polls whatever is conducted in ROK, and there is no base for any prediction.

One can, however, suppose that the future winner in the elections will not get in the present situation an absolute majority of votes. Most probably, the majority will be minimal. The fact that the opposition did not present a single candidate, but dispersed its strength between the several, does not increase its chances to succeed either. The Army and security forces are already in a state of combat readiness, and the authorities threaten severe punishment against all those who may be accused even of an attempt to organize any kind of disorder.

There is another interesting fact. The United States emphasizes by all possible means that it has no intention of intervening in the South Korean presidential election. Nevertheless, a high official of the Department of State—William Clark, deputy assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs—is going there now. Washington by all feasible means widely emphasizes its neutrality, but it will, of course, try to do everything possible to keep the U. S. military presence in the South of Korean Peninsula unchanged in any case. Indeed, 40,000 U.S. military personnel and about 1,000 pieces of nuclear armament are located there. This is the reason, why the neutral—quote unquote, of course—observer William Clark left for Seoul.

Ruling Party Candidate Leads

LD170944 Moscow TASS in English 0756 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Tokyo December 17 TASS—After the counting of 75 percent of votes cast for the candidates in balloting in the presidential elections in South Korea yesterday, it

was established that in the lead was No Tae-u, the candidate of the ruling Democratic Justice Party, who had won nearly 38 percent of votes. He is followed by Kim Young-sam, the candidate of the main opposition Reunification Democratic Party—26.5 percent, trailing behind whom is Kim Tae-chung from the opposition Peace and Democracy Party with 25.5 percent of votes.

According to reports from Seoul, South Korean newspapers have prepared banner headlines announcing the election of No Tae-u as the 13th South Korean president, who is predicted to win nearly 38 percent of all votes. The Japanese mass media consider the victory of No Tae-u to be fait accompli. The term of office of current president Chon Tu-hwan is due to expire on February 25 next year.

The returns of voting demonstrate that if opposition had nominated a single candidate, it could have defeated former General No Tae-u, who is now most likely to succeed Chon Tu-Hwan as the head of state. All of the country's democratic forces insisted on a single candidate, Yet Kim Young-sam and Kim Tae-chung, who were guided by their personal ambitions and were sure of their success, both participated in the election race. Kim Tae-chung formed his own party and led his supporters out of the Reunification Democratic Party, which was then the most powerful opposition party.

The presidential elections this year were the first direct elections in the country, which was ruled for many years by the military or governments backed by the military. The demands for a change in the constitution and election of the head of state not by an electoral college, but through direct suffrage were the main slogans in the powerful anti-dictatorial movement last summer. The elections were watched by tens of thousands of volunteers from public, student and religious organizations. According to the National Coalition for Democracy, the biggest anti-government association, machinations by representatives of the ruling camp were registered in the course of voting.

The leadership of the coalition held an emergency meeting today, upon closing of which a statement was made that the election returns were "unacceptable" in view of unprecedented machinations. It points out that the volunteers watching over the course of voting were beaten up and terrorized in polling stations. The leaders of the coalition announced their intention to meet today with Kim Young-sam, Kim Tae-chung and other opposition figures to discuss the question of further actions.

Addressing a press conference at the headquarters of the ruling Democratic Justice Party, No Tae-u announced himself the winner of the elections. He promised to make every effort to ensure stability and called for a "new era of democracy" in South Korea.

In his turn Kim Tae-chung noted that the elections had proceeded in an atmosphere of large-scale interference of the authorities, which had recourse to all sorts of gimmicks and broadly used the mass media for slandering the opposition candidates. He stressed that the elections had been unfair and placed all responsibility for that on No Tae-u and the current head of the Seoul regime Chon Tu-hwan.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Sihanouk Wants Further Talks With Hun Sen

BK170122 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1330 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] In Paris, Samdech Norodom Sihanouk has announced his desire to hold further talks with Comrade Hun Sen, chairman of the PRK Council of Ministers.

The first meeting was held 2-4 December in France. The samdech then decided to hold two more rounds of talks. However, a few days after the first meeting, Sihanouk sent a telegram to Comrade Hun Sen saying that he would not attend further talks if the Pol Pot group led by Khieu Samphan and the KPNLF group led by Son Sann refuse to attend. Sihanouk suddenly changed his stance after making this statement. This was much criticized at the ASEAN meeting in Manila.

The ASEAN countries have adhered to a stance of seeking a political solution to the Cambodian problem.

Japanese Presence at ASEAN Forum Assessed

PM170915 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[Vsevolod Ovchinnikov "Commentator's Column": "A Seventh in 'The Six'"]

[Text] A 2-day meeting of heads of state and government of the ASEAN countries has been held in Manila.

Since Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand, Malaysia, and Singapore formed ASEAN in 1967 (it was subsequently joined by Brunei), their leaders have met just three times.

Although economic cooperation is considered ASEAN's chief goal, the members of "the Six" cannot ignore political problems. Despite the imperialist powers' endeavors, the association does not want to become the tool of other people's intrigues or be drawn into an East-West confrontation. On the contrary, it has made a positive contribution to the region's political climate: It proposed turning it into a zone of peace, freedom, and neutrality and then advocated creating a nuclear-free zone in Southeast Asia.

It is obvious that favorable conditions have now taken shape for realizing those constructive initiatives. The Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and

Shorter-Range Missiles has opened the way to a nuclear-free world. The ASEAN members can rely on the experience of their neighbors, the parties to the Rarotonga Treaty. The public of the Philippines, where talks are soon to begin on the future fate of the U.S. military bases, is more actively opposed than ever to the U.S. military presence.

The participants in the Manila meeting confirmed their adherence to the idea of a nuclear-free zone in Southeast Asia but did not take any practical steps toward realizing it. It seems to me that a definite role was played here by the fact that there were seven participants in the meeting of "the Six." Japanese Prime Minister Takeshita took to Manila a program for Japanese economic aid in the form of preferential loans and credits to the value of 2 billion dollars. He declared that, in Tokyo's opinion, the U.S. bases in the Philippines help to strengthen Asian security. The calculation that the sharing out of the "Japanese pie" would provoke arguments and push into the background the discussion of undesirable questions for the United States was to some extent justified. This could be a gift for the master of the White House when Takeshita goes to Washington on a visit in January.

It is appropriate to recall that Nakasone also behaved in a similar way in the past. He began his foreign trips in Seoul, granting South Korea preferential loans of 4 billion dollars in order partly to finance the buildup of its military potential and the U.S. troops' upkeep. The Japanese money taken to Manila by the seventh participant in the meeting of "the Six" has a similar purpose: to further U.S. military-political ends if not directly, then indirectly.

Soviet-Vietnamese Economic Ties, Prospects Viewed
PM161001 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent B. Vinogradov interview in Da Nang with Tran Dinh Dam, chairman of Quang Nam-Danang Province People's Committee, interspersed by Soviet officials' comments under the heading "Force of Inertia and Quest for Reserves"; date not given; first two paragraphs and last two paragraphs are respectively editorial introduction and conclusion]

[Text] It is very clear from the map that Quang Nam-Danang Province appears to link the northern and southern halves of Vietnam. There can be no doubt that its geographical situation determines its special role in the republic's economic life to a considerable extent. Playing an important role in the formation of the SRV's unified economic structure, the province has had appreciable success in its own development in recent years. B. Vinogradov, IZVESTIYA correspondent in the SRV, had a meeting in Danang with Tran Dinh Dam, chairman of the provincial people's committee, and asked him to talk about the problems being resolved by the people's power and the contribution made by the province's working people to developing Soviet-Vietnamese cooperation. In his replies, Tran Dinh Dam touched on a number of serious issues, in our opinion, concerning efforts to improve Soviet-Vietnamese economic ties and make them more dynamic.

The IZVESTIYA editorial office approached senior personnel in the relevant Soviet departments and organizations with the request to comment on some of the things said by the chairman of Quang Nam-Danang Province People's Committee. Here we publish the conversation between our correspondent and Tran Dinh Dam and brief commentaries on this conversation sent to the editor's office in Moscow.

[Vinogradov] Comrade Dam, plans for Soviet-Vietnamese cooperation and its increasing scope in the current 5-year period and through 2000 envisage establishment of direct links between individual oblasts and provinces and enterprises and organizations. What is actually being done in this respect in Quang Nam-Danang?

[Tran Dinh Dam] We are ready to establish links of this kind at any moment. The province has broad export potential. We could offer our Soviet clients goods such as tea—tea plantations cover more than 1,000 hectares here—coffee, black pepper, cinnamon, and other spices. Our sewn goods industry has good experience of working with raw material supplied by the Soviet Union. This form of cooperation helps us to solve the employment problem and enables us to obtain foreign currency.

Our province is also involved in implementing a series of intergovernmental agreements. Take the 1985 agreement, for example, on Vietnamese fruit and vegetable exports to the Soviet Union. It makes particular provision for establishment of a specialized agro-industrial combine near Danang to cultivate and process 34,000 tonnes of pineapples per year. The original intention was to begin building in 1986 and complete the project in 1988. The SRV Ministry of Agriculture and the Food Industry instructed us, that is, the provincial People's Committee, to implement and finance this project.

In line with the accord, at least 1 year ago we assigned three state farms to this task and designated sectors to build warehouses, refrigerated units, and a canning plant. The Soviet side, represented by the USSR Gosagroprom, under the terms of the agreement is to provide technical assistance in the design work and to supply the necessary materials and equipment. However, when it was calculated that the cost of building the agro-industrial combine would exceed 370 million dong, we realized that we could not afford such a large sum for the provincial budget without the necessary credit. The start date for the construction work was postponed, and the deadline for completing the project has been extended to 1990.

So, at the moment, pineapples are still exported to the Soviet Union in unprocessed form, which naturally results in large losses during their transportation. [Tran Dinh Dam ends]

Comment by A.Z. Chertkov, deputy general director of the "Vneshtekhagroprom" All-Union Association:

"It is indeed true that the deadline for completing the construction of the agro-industrial combine near Danang has been put back several years. What is more, due to a shortage of resources in the SRV state budget for capital construction, it has been decided to cut the total number of planned projects in the fruit and vegetable sector from 18 to 7. The Danang agro-industrial combine is one of the biggest of these. We share the provincial leadership's concern regarding finance. At the same time, I would like to stress that the problem of sources of finance for construction of these projects must be decided at government level. The earliest possible solution to this issue will result in more reliable fulfillment of the sides' mutual obligations, as set out in the 1985 agreement on Vietnamese fruit and vegetable exports to the Soviet Union."

[Vinogradov] It is well known that approximately 85% of the ships that dock in Danang are sailing under the Soviet flag. What is your opinion of the port's activity, and does it meet current requirements?

[Tran Dinh Dam] Danang is the third largest port in Vietnam after Ho Chi Minh City and Haiphong, and it is also the deepest. It was built in the sixties by the Americans as a transshipment point for the military equipment brought into Vietnam during the war of aggression. The moorage facilities have not once been repaired in the last 20 or so years. Only 6 of the 10 cranes are still fully operational. The level of mechanization in loading and unloading operations is quite low, although the port handles 600,000 tonnes of freight per year. Manual labor predominates. Consequently, the time spent in port by a vessel with a displacement of, say, 10,000 tonnes, carrying a load of cement, fertilizers, or equipment, is 15 days on average. This is a long time, of course. More than once we have discussed ways to speed up the unloading process with the USSR Ministry of the Maritime Fleet's mission here. Everyone realizes that mechanization and repair are essential. This opinion was also reached by a competent Soviet delegation which surveyed the port last year. We have requested equipment for Danang and assistance with repair work on account of future freight-handling services. This seems to be mutually advantageous. Good equipment and machinery will considerably reduce the time a ship spends standing in port. Considering the expensive nature of the freight and current losses from idle time, one can imagine that all outlays on modernizing the port will be recouped in a very short space of time. Time passes, however, and no real decision has been taken. [Tran Dinh Dam ends]

Comment by D.V. Ageyev, a member of the transport group of the Soviet-Vietnamese Intergovernmental Commission on Economic and Scientific and Technical Cooperation:

"The idle time of Soviet ships in Danang and other Vietnamese ports is still considerable. For example, in 1986, it amounted to more than 2,500 ship-days for dry-cargo ships. This really costs us an enormous amount of money. As far as the moorage facilities in Danang port are concerned, as the provincial leader has rightly pointed out, they need to be repaired and reequipped. However, Danang was not included on the list of cooperation projects when the 5-year plans were being drawn up, despite the fact that we and our Vietnamese colleagues asked our planning organizations to do this.

"Our ties are currently based on intergovernmental agreements. Unfortunately, we do not yet have experience in cooperating directly with foreign partners in construction projects and the supply of freight-handling equipment. These tasks have yet to be resolved."

[Vinogradov] In their plans for the future, our countries have adopted a course aimed at developing ties between Vietnam and parts of Siberia and the Far East. But Quang Nam-Danang Province is twinned with the Latvian SSR.

[Tran Dinh Dam] Yes, we have been twinned with Latvia for several years. Delegations from the Baltic region have been guests in our province. We have organized Latvian culture festivals and put on exhibitions. But for some reason, matters go no further than these rare cultural contacts. I have been led to understand that being twinned may also include certain production ties and the exchange of experience and specialists in various fields. One day someone came up with the idea of forming an enterprise here which could assemble electronic equipment from the Riga State Electrical Engineering Plant. We have the necessary manpower. This form of cooperation is actively used by Japanese firms in Ho Chi Minh City, incidentally. We could organize seafood production with Latvian fishermen, as our coastal waters are teeming with shrimps, lobsters, and crabs. In short, there is plenty of scope for cooperation. What is needed is initiative—on both sides. [Tran Dinh Dam ends]

Comment by V.Ye. Kireyev, general director of the Latvian Fishing Industry Production Association and chairman of the Riga branch of the Soviet-Vietnamese Friendship Society:

"It goes without saying that twinned regions should more actively develop cooperation in the business sphere as well as their cultural ties. We have built up a certain amount of experience in this direction in recent years. For example, production ties have been established between the Riga Experimental Technological Equipment Plant and the machine plant in Danang, between

the Latvian "Straume" Production Association and the Danang Glass Factory, and between some vocational and technical schools. Young workers from Quang Nam-Danang train at our enterprises. We are prepared to discuss the issue of establishing direct links in the fishing industry.

"I think we will have more feasible opportunities in this respect when, in addition to developing cultural cooperation, new forms of cooperative ties are assimilated and enterprises are given economic independence."

[Vinogradov] As we have already touched on the subject of cultural ties, could you perhaps say a few words about tourism?

[Tran Dinh Dam] There are excellent beaches and an unpolluted sea close to Danang, and the weather is warm enough for bathing all the year round. We have already built several cottages on the coast. They are always booked. We have suggested that Inturist expand cooperation with us and invest in building new hotels and camp sites. The conditions seem to be right for this. There is a great deal of interest here for visitors and tourists. There are world famous monuments in nearby Hue. Just imagine, working people from the Far East could spend their holidays on the coast, which is nearer to them than Sochi or Yalta, incidentally. I seem to have become carried away. But then, why not, if the possibilities are there? [Tran Dinh Dam ends]

Comment by V.Ya. Pavlov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Tourism:

"I have just recently come back from Vietnam, where I held talks with the leadership of the main Vietnamese tourist board. We signed an intergovernmental agreement on expanding and strengthening cooperation in tourism, under whose terms Inturist will open its offices in Hanoi and our Vietnamese colleagues will open an office in Moscow. We also looked into the question of forming a joint Soviet-Vietnamese tourist enterprise. The number of Soviet tourists visiting Vietnam will increase over the next few years.

"Our cooperation has risen to a higher—interstate—level with the signing of this agreement. There can be no question that the proposals from Danang deserve attention. We now have plans to jointly build a hotel in Hanoi. We believe that our experience will spread to Danang and other Vietnamese cities."

[IZVESTIYA's concluding comment] It is clear from the above that conditions do exist for achieving these aims. The people we spoke to were well aware that Vietnamese economic difficulties arising from a shortage of resources available for capital construction complicate the realization of many major projects in Soviet-Vietnamese cooperation. They were unanimous in the opinion that direct contacts between individual regions and enterprises would help to solve many problems, objective and subjective. But in addition to the search for sources of finance, something is holding them back: Is it the force of inertia, a lack of initiative, or caution?

The economic reforms being carried out in our countries open the doors to further developing mutually advantageous cooperation and making it more effective. Making the most of these conditions is an urgent necessity.

Satellite To Beam TV Programs to Australia

PM161621 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Dec 87 First Edition p 5

[Dispatch by own correspondent A. Ivkin: "Via Satellite"]

[Text] Sydney, 11 Dec—Soviet television programs will be regularly relayed to Australia via satellite from 1 January. Concerts and documentaries about life in the Soviet Union will be shown....

The idea for regular retransmissions [translyatsii] of the Soviet first television program comes from the Sydney company Kerli [name as published], which has concluded a contract with Central Television in Moscow. Initially only subscribers with a parabolic aerial will receive Soviet programs. In Australia only public establishments, clubs, and hotels have the right to install them.

Near East & South Asia

CPSU Discusses Ties With Afghan Provinces

PM171311 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Dec 87 Second Edition p 2

[TASS Report—"Giving All-Round Assistance to the Afghan People"]

[Text] A conference took place at the CPSU Central Committee on 16 December on the question of developing direct sponsorship links between Soviet Republics and Oblasts and Afghanistan's Provinces.

Taking part in its work were Vitaliy Vorotnikov, Yegor Ligachev, Nikolay Slyunkov, Viktor Chebrikov, and Eduard Shevardnadze, members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo; Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Vsevolod Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Vladimir Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; leaders of party and local Soviet bodies of the union republics and oblasts; of central ministries and departments; of the AUCCTU; of the Komsomol Central Committee; and leading members of the mass media.

A report was made by Eduard Shevardnadze.

K. Makhkamov, first secretary of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee; L.A. Borodin, first secretary of Astrakhan CPSU Obkom; A. M. Masaliyev, first secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee; S. Niyazov, first secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee; P. P. Mozhayev, USSR ambassador to Afghanistan; and M.M. Kushnerenko, first secretary of Kherson Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom, talked about the establishment of a new form of our traditionally good-neighborly relations with Afghanistan.

The speeches noted the great importance of internationalist assistance to the Afghan people being rendered by the population of the Soviet republics and regions, by work collectives in several economic branches.

This assistance is called upon to facilitate the solution of vital economic and social problems facing the Afghan provinces, as well as the implementation of the policy of national reconciliation initiated and vigorously pursued by the PDPA with support from the Republic's patriotic forces.

Thanks to direct assistance of this kind, a number of Afghan enterprises resumed operation, schools and health institutions are being fitted out with equipment, and power and water supplies to populated localities have been restored. National personnel are being trained, too.

Broader contacts between public organizations and friendship between children in the two coutnries are having a favorable effect. All that is highly praised by the Afghan leadership and ordinary Afghans and deserves most vigorous support and all-round consolidation.

Yegor Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, addressed the meeting.

Shevardnadze Discusses DRA With UN's Cordovez

LD151843 Moscow TASS in English 1835 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, today received U.N. Under-Secretary-General Diego Cordovez, currently in Moscow.

They discussed issues related to the earliest completion of the process of political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan and conclusion of corresponding accords at the Afghan-Pakistani talks carried out at Geneva through Cordovez.

Shevardnadze stressed the readiness of the Soviet Union and Afghanistan to facilitate the success of Cordovez' mission. This followed from Mikhail Gorbachev's remarks at a press conference in Washington and the address by Afghan President Najibullah, made at the recent Loya Jirgah in Kabul.

The withdrawal of the Soviet troops within 12 months (this period could be reduced in the event of progress in national reconciliation in Afghanistan) created a new situation.

This realistic approach, taking into account the interrelationship between internal and external aspects of the settlement, paved the way for advancement in all directions in the interests of securing peace and tranquility on Afghan soil.

Cordovez informed Shevardnadze in detail about his steps on preparing another round of Afghan-Pakistani talks. He expressed the hope that that round would become a concluding one.

Moscow Optimistic on Afghan-Pakistani Talks

TA161955 Moscow in Dari to Afghanistan 1700 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Unattributed commentary]

[Excerpts] Dear listeners, at present Diego Cordoves, assistant to the UN Secretary General, is paying a visit to Moscow. He met with Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Politburo and Soviet foreign minister, and held talks with other Soviet officials. We now draw your attention to a commentary by Radio Moscow's analyst in this connection:

According to reports by the Soviet press, Diego Cordovez's current mission is directly linked to the issue of a political solution of the situation around Afghanistan. As you are aware, he holds the task of mediator in the indirect talks between Afghan and Pakistani officials conducted in Geneva. As a result of the latest round of these talks, it became feasible for the two sides to bring their positions considerably closer. As was reported earlier, the two sides reached agreement on 3 basic documents in this round of talks. Now the question is how to reach agreement over the 4th document that relates to the timetable of the withdrawal of the limited Soviet military contingent from Afghanistan to the homeland.

Dear listeners, in this connection one should first of all pay attention to the timing of the arrival of the UN envoy to Moscow. The events of the beginning of December have laid the basis for the serious expectation of the possibility that the fabricated Afghan problem will be resolved at the earliest time. Reference here is made to the visit by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev to the United States and his meetings and talks with U.S. President Ronald Reagan. During this visit to the United States, the CPSU Central Committe General Secretary

once again affirmed that Soviet authorities are still committed to the concept of the earliest solution of this problem by peaceful and political means. [passage omitted]

Right now Diego Cordovez is visiting Moscow. While conferring with Cordovez, Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze referred to the readiness of the Soviet Union and Afghanistan to prepare the ground for the success of his mission in Geneva. He drew attention to the creation of new conditions for resolving the Afghan problem, as well as to the possibility of the practical achievement of the new initiative by Afghan President Dr Najibullah. [passage omitted]

On his part, Diego Cordovez, assistant to the UN Secretary General, apparently taking into consideration the results of his visit to Moscow, expressed the hope that the next round of Afghan-Pakistani talks in Geneva will turn into the final round of these talks.

These are the facts. As our dear listeners are observing, these facts are hopeful and create the ground for optimism. At any rate, the leaderships of both Afghanistan and the Soviet Union are currently exerting all efforts so that the two sides in Geneva will not have any disagreement with regard to the 4th document for a political solution of the problem. Not much time is left until this moment.

DRA's Najibullah Receives AUCCTU Delegation

PM170909 Moscow TRUD in Russian 16 Dec 87 p 3

[TASS report: "Delegation Visit"]

[Text] Kabul, 15 Dec—Afghan President Najibullah today received an AUCCTU delegation headed by AUCCTU Secretary G.I. Yanayev, which is here at the invitation of the Central Council of Trade Unions of Afghanistan.

The course of national reconciliation proclaimed by the PDPA, Najibullah said during the conversation that took place, reflects the will of the Afghan people. We will advance firmly and confidently in this direction, conscious of the increasing support and revolutionary solidarity of many countries and progressive forces.

Afghan trade unions will continue to actively promote the implementation of the policy of national reconciliation, the president noted. Their confidence here derives from the support of the Soviet Union, which was shown once again at the Washington summit.

An agreement on developing friendly ties and cooperation between the AUCCTU and the Central Council of Trade Unions of Afghanistan was signed the same day.

Iraq's Husayn Receives Soviet Envoy Sutenko

LD171316 Moscow TASS in English 1238 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Baghdad December 17 TASS—President Saddam Husayn of Iraq has received Mikhail Sytenko, a special envoy of the Soviet leadership, who informed the Iraqi leader of the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

Saddam Husayn positively appraised the results of the Washington summit, and pointed out its great importance for the beginning of headway and further advance along the road of disarmament and relaxation of international tension.

There was an exchange of views on issues concerning the situation in the Persian Gulf area and the Iran-Iraq war.

Ways to implement the U.N. Security Council's resolution 598 calling for the establishment of peace and stability in the region were discussed.

Tariq 'Aziz, Iraqi minister of Foreign Affairs, was present during the meeting.

East Europe

Envoy Sees 'No Problems' With INF Ratification

LD170344 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2027 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Belgrade, Dec 16 (TANJUG)—The agreement eliminating medium- and shorter-range missiles does not pertain to the U.S. and the Soviet Union alone, but also to all their allies in the territories of which these nuclear weapons are sited—said Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vadim Longinov at his press conference in the Soviet Embassy here today.

Having said that the agreement covers a total of nine states, counting in the U.S. and the USSR, Loginov pointed out that the agreement could not have been enforced without the participation of all the states concerned.

Loginov is in Belgrade to inform Yugoslav leaders, on behalf of the Soviet leadership, about the Gorbachev-Reagan summit in Washington.

Referring to the circles of the Supreme Soviet, Loginov said that there would be no problems on the Soviet side concerning the ratification of the agreement signed by Gorbachev and Reagan in Washington. He added that Washington had announced no problems from the American side either.

Loginov underscored that an accord in principle on reducing by 50 per cent the strategic offensive nuclear arms was a very significant results of the Reagan-Gorbachev summit. This accord, as Loginov said, would require Washington's giving up the Star Wars program.

He said the Soviet Union had equipment capable of 100-percent ascertaining whether a ship carries, and how many, nuclear missiles. As he put it, in case an agreement is made to this effect the Soviet Union would cede this equipment to the U.S.

Loginov denied Western allegations about the Warsaw Pact's superior conventional armament, and said that the West had not dealt with the true facts.

In Washington, said Loginov, Reagan and Gorbachev discussed hotbeds of crises and humanitarian questions, but the two sides' stand towards these points differed.

Having underlined that it was the task of superpowers to help crises be solved in the world through the full respect of national interests of other countries, Loginov reiterated Moscow's readiness to pull out troops from Afghanistan in less than a year's time provided that external interference had stopped.

Kosovo Official on Combating 'Separatism'

PM161025 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS report under the rubric "Facts, Events, Opinions": "Underground Organizations Neutralized"]

[Text] Belgrade, 10 Dec—As the result of an increase in hostile activity by nationalist elements, the political situation in the Socialist Autonomous Province of Kosovo is still complex.

Journalists were told this by Rahman Morina, Kosovo's internal affairs secretary. His statement was published in today's press.

The eyes of all the Yugoslav public are on the situation in Kosovo. Most of the people living in this province are Albanians, but Kosovo's indigenous population also includes Serbs, Montenegrins, and representatives of other nationalities. Three underground organizations whose members are in favor of nationalism and separatism have been uncovered and neutralized in the province in recent months, R. Morina said. Kosovo, he emphasized, is the least developed region of Yugoslavia. This is a legacy of the past still to be overcome and that is why the SFRY Presidium and the LCY Central Committee Presidium regard accelerated economic and cultural growth in Kosovo as a task concerning the whole of Yugoslav society that must be resolved without delay.

LCY's KOMUNIST Cited on Internal Problems

PM161711 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Dec 87 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Sharov dispatch under the general heading: "Fraternal Newspapers: From the Latest Issue"]

[Text] Belgrade, 15 Dec—Turning to the materials of the recent LCY Central Committee Plenum, the weekly KOMUNIST points out that questions of enhancing the responsibility of party members, whatever posts they hold, occupied a central place in its work.

The topicality of this approach to cadre policy, the LCY organ writes, is determined by a number of circumstances. There have been no decisive changes in economic life. The country is entering 1988 with a load of unsolved problems. At the same time, many loud words have been and are being said about the need to step up work, develop criticism and self-criticism, and so forth. The plenum leveled serious complaints at the LCY Central Committee Presidium and the top party organizations of the republics and krajs.

The weekly points out that the consistent implementation of the principle of democratic centralism will help the party rid itself of those who campaign verbally for changes while in fact doing all they can to slow them down. The LCY leading organs, KOMUNIST continues, bear great responsibility for resolutely eliminating manifestations and trends of federalization in the party. Communists have a right to expect the LCY conference which it is planned to convene next March to be an abrupt turning point in the work of party organizations, the weekly concludes.

Trade Protocols Signed With GDR, Romania

PM161555 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Cooperation Developing"]

[Text] An intergovernmental protocol on commodity turnover between the USSR and the GDR for 1988, which provides for further development of mutually beneficial trade, was signed in Moscow on 11 December.

The GDR will continue to occupy a leading place in Soviet trade and the USSR will remain the GDR's chief trading partner.

The protocol provides the foundation for the implementation of reciprocal supplies of goods on the basis of direct production ties between the two countries' enterprises and organizations and other progressive forms of cooperation. It provides for the reciprocal supply of goods and raw materials and the provision of services connected with the implementation of the Comprehensive Program for CEMA Countries' Scientific and Technical Progress Through the Year 2000.

An intergovernmental protocol on commodity turnover between the USSR and Romania for 1988 was signed on the same day.

In preparing the protocol, the sides examined questions connected with the implementation of the Comprehensive Program for CEMA Countries' Scientific and Technical Progress Through the Year 2000. Here the protocol reflects for the first time the sides' obligations in the area of direct production ties.

Sorokin, Delegation Received by GDR's Kessler

PM151647 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Dec 87 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Reception in Berlin"]

[Text] Berlin, 14 Dec—Army General H. Kessler, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and GDR minister of national defense, received here today a Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate delegation headed by Admiral A.I. Sorokin, first deputy chief of the Main Political Directorate.

GDR servicemen, the minister emphasized, welcome the signing of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles. They see it as their patriotic and international duty to reliably stand guard over socialism and peace together with servicemen of the Soviet Armed Forces and the other fraternal armies.

Mutual Supplies Protocol Signed With GDR

LD121422 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1418 GMT 11 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, 11 Dec (ADN)—The protocol on mutual supplies of goods and payments between the GDR and USSR in 1988 was signed on Friday in Moscow by the two countries' ministers of foreign trade, Dr Gerhard Beil and Boris Aristov.

The planned exports and imports will primarily comprise products which are the result of new scientific-technological research and development and aim at deepening specialization and cooperation. Reciprocal supplies of equipment and machinery for development of key technologies will be stepped up.

The GDR will supply the USSR with machine tools, including automated flexible production sections, opencast mining equipment, bucket-ladder excavators and cranes, rolling mill equipment, chemical plants, thermoplastic plants, road-building machinery, printing machinery, textile machinery, agricultural machinery, equipment for the foodstuffs industry, special technological equipment for microelectronics, for the optical industry and scientific instruments manufacture, as well as passenger train carriages and refrigerated wagons. The exporting of ships and maritime equipment, electrical engineering/electronics products, electronic data and other computer equipment, as well as of chemical products and consumer goods, will be continued.

The USSR will supply the GDR in 1988 to a considerable extent with industrial goods, including machine tools, equipment for heavy engineering and the power industry, electronic components, computers of various types, components for textile and printing machinery, excavators, bulldozers, tractors, antifriction bearings, heavy ggods vehicles, and cars.

On the basis of long-term agreements, Soviet supplies of crude petroleum and natural gas, coal and coke, pig iron and metal industry products, timber and chemical wood pulp, as well as numerous chemical products, were agreed. This applies also to tires, technical consumer goods, photographic and movie equipment, and semiluxuries.

Minister Beil said in Moscow while signing the document that the state agreements of reciprocal supplies and services for 1988 are an expression of the higher level of economic relations between the GDR and USSR. The two countries are each other's biggest foreign trade partners.

Minister Beil spoke about the preparation of an important GDR exhibition in Moscow in September/October 1988. The exhibition's aim is to deepen and consolidate the bases for development of economic relations between the GDR and USSR.

BCP Visitors Study Agro-Industry Leadership

PM151403 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading "Interparty Ties"]

[Text] A group of BCP party workers headed by R. Draganov, deputy chief of the BCP Central Committee Agriculture Department, was in the Soviet Union 7 through 11 December in accordance with the plan for CPSU-BCP ties. During this time, the group familiarized itself with CPSU experience in directing scientific support for the agro-industrial complex.

The Bulgarian comrades had conversations at the CPSU Central Committee Department of Agriculture and the Food Industry, the Moscow CPSU Obkom, other party committees, and the USSR Gosagroprom. It also visited a number of agricultural science research establishments and enterprises.

Chemical Venture Plan Concluded With Poland

PM161453 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Dec 87 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Soviet-Polish Agreement"]

[Text] Warsaw, 11 Dec—A Soviet-Polish intergovernmental agreement on the creation, expansion, and activity of a joint enterprise producing domestic chemical products, perfumery goods, and cosmetics has been concluded in Krakow. The contract was signed by Yu. A. Bespalov, USSR minister of the Chemical Industry, and J. Bilip, Polish minister of Industry.

The new enterprise will be set up on the basis of the existing Pollena-Miraculum perfumery factory in Krakow, whose wares are well-known in the Soviet Union. The USSR will provide equipment, material, and credits

for the expansion and retooling of the factory. The enterprise will operate on the principle of full economic accountabilty [khozraschet], and it is planned to sell its output in the Soviet Union, Poland, and the markets of third countries.

Finland's Ahde, A. E. Voss Note INF Treaty

PM161717 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 10 December A. E. Voss, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, had a meeting with M. Ahde, speaker of the Finnish parliament. It was noted during the friendly conversation that the Soviet and Finnish peoples are united by trust, amicability, and multifaceted, mutually advantageous cooperation. The further deepening of Soviet-Finnish relations, including at the parliamentary level, was discussed in this context.

The sides noted with satisfaction that the signing of the Soviet-American treaty to eliminate two classes of nuclear missiles opens the way to new specific measures aimed at disarmament and the strengthening of universal security.

West Europe

Shultz Arrives in London; To Meet Thatcher, Howe

LD161104 Moscow TASS in English 0934 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] London December 16 TASS—U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, touring a number of West European countries, arrived in London on Tuesday.

He plans to have today negotiations with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and Foreign Secretay Geoffry Howe. In the course of the negotiations George Shultz is to speak on the results of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Washington. The sides will also discuss such question as East-West relations, reduction of armaments and the situation in different regions of the world.

In the course of the tour the U.S. secretary of state visited Belgium where he attended a NATO council session at the level of foreign ministers of NATO member countries, Denmark, Norway and the FRG.

Soviets Brief Europeans on Summit Results

Consultations With Irish

LD161113 Moscow TASS in English 1100 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Dublin December 16 TASS—Soviet-Irish consultations were held here between Padraig Murphy, head of the political Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ireland, and Nikolay Uspenskiy, special envoy of the Soviet leadership, head of the Second European Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. Gennadiy Uranov, ambassador of the U.S.S.R. to the Republic of Ireland, took part in the consultations.

The sides had a detailed discussion of key international problems.

The Soviet side dwelt on the results of the official visit of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the United States and his talks with U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

The Irish side reaffirmed the positive appriasal of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles made by Prime Minister Charles Haughey of Ireland in his message to the leaders of the U.S.S.R. and the United States.

The sides also discussed matters pertaining to bilateral relations.

Meeting With Swiss Official

LD161331 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1307 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Berne, 16 Dec (TASS)—A meeting took place here today between Vladimir Lomeyko, special representative of the Soviet leadership, and Edouard Brunner, secretary of state at the Foreign Ministry of Switzerland. The Soviet representative informed the secretary of state of the outcome of the summit meeting in Washington between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

During the conversation, in which Zoya Novozhilova, ambassador of the USSR in Switzerland, also took part, the exceptionally important significance was noted of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles for lowering the level of nuclear confrontation and for strengthening international security. Both sides stressed the need for increased efforts toward reducing weapons in the world and strengthening the climate of mutual trust and cooperation.

Austria's Vranitzky Informed

LD161557 Moscow TASS in English 1530 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Vienna December 16 TASS—Federal Chancellor Franz Vranitzky of Austria today received Oleg Grinevskiy, special representative of the Soviet leadership and ambassador at large. He informed the chancellor about the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington. They held an in-depth exchange of views on pressing issues of nuclear disarmament and reducing conventional armaments as well as East-West relations.

Vranitzky welcomed the conclusion of the treaty to abolish intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles and the new prospects for a fundamental improvement of the situation in the world and especially for Europe opening up as a result of the talks between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan. He assessed positively the Soviet leadership's efforts in the cause of preserving peace.

Grinevskiy also informed Hans Blix, director-general of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), about the outcome of the Soviet-U.S. summit in Washington.

Finnish President Briefed

LD161253 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1210 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Helsinki, 16 Dec (TASS)—President Mauno Koivisto of the Finnish Republic has received Valentin Nikiforov, special representative of the Soviet leadership and USSR deputy foreign minister, who informed him of the official visit of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretay of the CPSU Central Committee, to the United States and the results of the Soviet-U.S. talks. Vladimir Sobolev, USSR ambassador to Finland, took part in the conversation.

Valentin Nikiforov also met and held talks with Finnish Prime Minister Kalevi Sorsa; Chancellery Minister Ilkka Kanerva; and Aake Wihtol, secretary of state for foreign affairs.

Antonov, FRG's Bangemann on Economic Cooperation

LD152323 Moscow TASS in English 2200 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow Dec 15 TASS—A meeting of co-chairmen of the commission of the USSR and the FRG for economic, scientific and technological cooperation—deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Minister Aleksey Antonov and FRG Minister of Economics Martin Bangemann—was held in Moscow on December 14-15. A thorough exchange of opinions on concrete questions of economic ties between the USSR and the FRG with taking into account the restructuring of external economic activity implemented in the Soviet Union was held in a businesslike and constructive atmosphere. This restructuring opens new opportunities for economic interaction of organizations and enterprises of the two countries. Questions of the state of and prospects for cooperation between Soviet enterprises and FRG firms on the basis of cooperation in production and creation of joint ventures, as well as the use of other forms of joint work, were discussed in this context. Questions connected with the holding in the Soviet Union in the first six months of 1988 a regular session of the commission of the USSR and the FRG on economic, scientific and technological cooperation were also discussed.

Soviet-FRG Colloquium Opens in Salzgitter

LD151327 Moscow TASS in English 1226 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Salzgitter December 15 TASS—TASS correspondents Gennadiy Kulbitskiy and Vladimir Serov report:

A Soviet-West German colloquium devoted to prospects in relations between the USSR and West Germany and issues of advancing cooperation in the economy, science and technology opened here today.

The forum, which is sponsored by the federation of "FRG-USSR" Societies and the Union of Soviet Societies of Friendship and Cultural Ties With Foreign Countries and the "USSR-FRG" Society, is held once in two years alternatively in both countries.

Attending the colloquium is the Soviet delegation led by Sergey Losev, president of the "USSR-FRG" Society, deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and director-general of TASS news agency. The West German side is represented by West German Government and Lower Saxony officials, politicians and public figures of prominence, members of the business community.

Ernst Pieper greeted the gathering. The chairman of the trusteeship council of the federation of "FRG-USSR" Societies and chairman of the board of the West German largest state-run concern "Salzgitter", emphasized that the forum was held at the moment when the signing of the Soviet-U.S. treaty to abolish intermediate-range and shorter range missiles could become a historic turning point in East-West relations. We hope, he said, that the treaty signed will set the beginning to the nuclear disarmament age.

Dietrich Sperling, president of the "FRG-USSR" Societies Federation, deputy of the Bundestag from the Social Democratic Party of Germany, who was the next to take the floor, said that true security could not be guaranteed by the develoment of ever more sophisticated types of weaponry and their amassment. Greater security can be achieved only through further disarmament and also the development of all-round mutually profitable cooperation between the East and the West, specifically, between the USSR and West Germany.

The head of the Soviet delegation paid considerable attention in his report to the outcome of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting and the INF (intermediate nuclear forces) treaty signed at it. This unprecedented treaty, he said, envisages the total elimination of two classes of nuclear armaments at once, which by their destructive potential are equal to 200 Second World Wars. This is a genuine demonstration of the new thinking, the shedding of stereotypes and notions whch earlier seemed unshakable. It is exactly this approach which should also be guided by in relations between the USSR and West Germany.

The building of the common European home is inconceivable without vigorous interaction of our two states, the speaker went on. The stability and solid nature of relations between them would be of genuinely historic significance since both states can play a very big role in European and world development.

In conclusion, Sergey Losev stressed that the Soviet Union was prepared for fruitful development of cooperation with West Germany in all areas—diplomatic, economic, scientific-technical and cultural—so as to open a new page in Soviet-West German relations. Our societies—the Union of Soviet Societies of Friendship and Cultural Ties with Foreign Countries and the federation of "FRG-USSR" Societies—could make a meaningful contribution to this cause.

Yuriy Kvitsinskiy, ambassador of the USSR to the Federal Republic of Germany, takes part in the colloquium.

Accords 'Impetus' to Cooperation

LD162142 Moscow TASS in English 1659 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Salzgitter December 16 TASS—TASS correspondents Gennadiy Kulbitskiy and Vladimir Serov report:

The participants in the Soviet-West German colloquium underway here discussed today the state of and prospects for economic, scientific and technological cooperation between the USSR and the FRG. Most speakers expressed the thought that the process of restructuring underway in the USSR creates favourable conditions for the development and speeding up of such cooperation. It was noted that the intergovernmental agreement on scientific and technological cooperation and three interdepartmental specialized agreements on cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy, agrarian research and the health services and medical science, concluded this year, can and must give a strong impetus to this cooperation.

Soviet participants in the colloquium pointed out that a number of decisions aimed at the development, along with traditional, also of new progressive forms of cooperation, including the creation of joint ventures, was adopted in the USSR of late. Arrangements have been reached on creating five such Soviet-West German joint enterprises. A large number of ministries, production amalgamations and enterprises has been given the right for independent activities on the foreign market.

Representatives of the Soviet delegation emphasized that the transition of the USSR economy to a fundamentally new system of economic management, to start since the beginning of 1988, gives much scope for independence and initiative of enterprises. The law on the state enterprise is called upon to play a great role in this. The speakers also noted that a keen struggle for the implementation of these ideas, the struggle between the old and the new methods of economic management, is underway in the USSR. The confidence was expressed that by the end of the current five-year period this process will be successfully concluded. It is necessary, however, to intensify mutually advantageous cooperation between the two countries.

Speaking at the colloquium, Minister of Economics and Transport in the Government of Lower Saxony Land Walter Hirche emphasized particularly the importance of the development of mutual contacts between prominent representatives of the economy of both countries. The minister said that the leaders of Lower Saxony are aware of a great importance of the Soviet market for the development of the land's economy. Technological exchange, alongside trade, must play the decisive role in this. We are aware of the fact that there are many technologies in the Soviet Union which West German firms are interested to get.

The intergovernmental agreement on scientific and technological cooperation between the USSR and the FRG opens a new stage in the interaction of our two countries in the sphere of science and technology, head of a department of the FRG Ministry of Research and Technology Joseph Rembser said in his report. The difference of socio-political systems must not be an obstacle for such cooperation. It is necessary to be guided by the awareness that the expansion of economic cooperation can help ease tension in the world, can promote peaceful development of the globe and its population, he said.

Nevertheless, Rembser made an attempt to present in a wrong light the Soviet Union's policy in the area of science and scientific research and resorted to distortion of facts. Manipulating with figures he alleged that only five per cent of the budgetary allocations for scientific research is spent on military purposes in the FRG while 50 per cent, that is ten times more, is spent in the Soviet Union.

The Soviet side stated outright that these are invented figures. It was said in this connection that not a single state in the world would be able to exist, much less to develop, spending so vast sums on military research and projects. As to the FRG, it is known that a considerable part of such expenditures is concealed in the budgets of other ministries.

First Soviet-Franco-Italian Enterprise Set Up

LD152316 Moscow TASS in English 2150 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—A press conference which was held here today dealt with the establishment of Interquadro, the first Soviet-Franco-Italian joint enterprise for the introduction and maintenance of electronic computing equipment.

The USSR State Agri-Industrial Committee, the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Technical Education, and the Aniral U.T.E.C. (France) and Delta Trading (Italy) firms participate in Interquadro.

The functions of the new enterprise is to introduce computing and microprocessor equipment to agriculture and industry of the USSR at an accelerated pace, to design and develop systems for computer-aided projection of production, and to train specialists in the field of electronic computers. Interquadro also intends to sell software abroad under orders placed by foreign partners.

At the initial stage Interquadro will employ not more than 60 people, among them 5-6 foreign specialists, it was announced at the press conference. Subsequently, specialists of other Soviet organizations will be invited to participate in the filling of orders.

Today Soviet and foreign partners placed their first orders with the newly-founded joint enterprise. The orders include those for the maintenance of computing equipment imported into the USSR, and the development of automated control systems for large agricultural complexes, and the training of specialists.

Interquadro has become the 16th joint-venture enterprise in the Soviet Union.

CP of Peoples of Spain Delegation Visits USSR

PM161103 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading "Interparty Ties"]

[Text] A delegation of the Communist Party of the Peoples of Spain [PCPE] headed by Luis Cabo Bravo, member of the Executive Committee and secretary of the party Central Committee in charge of agitation and propaganda, was in the Soviet Union 5 through 11 December to learn about CPSU experience of propaganda work in accordance with the plan for CPSU-PCPE ties.

The Spanish comrades were received at the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda and International Departments, held conversations at the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Social Sciences, the PRAVDA newspaper offices and the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, and visited the Moscow Gorkom House of Political Enlightenment and the Moscow CPSU Obkom.

Finnish Social Democrats Visit Soviet Union

PM150905 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] In accordance with the plan for interparty ties between the CPSU and the Finnish Social Democratic Party, a delegation of Finnish Social Democratic Party officials headed by M. Ahde, vice chairman [title as published] of the party and speaker of the Finnish Parliament, was in the Soviet Union 7-11 December.

The Finnish comrades were briefed on work by party organizations to implement the decisions of the 27th party congress and subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums and the progress of restructuring in different spheres of the country's life.

Conversations were held in the CPSU Central Committee Organizational Party Work and International Departments, the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Ties with Foreign Countries, and the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA editorial board. The delegation toured Vladimir Oblast, where it had a conversation at the CPSU obkom and was briefed on the activity of party and public organizations.

Greece's Papandreou Interviewed on INF Summit

LD162331 Moscow TASS in English 2140 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 16 TASS—Greece welcomes the initiatives which the USSR has been coming up with for a long time now pressing for nuclear disarmament, Andreas Papandreou, prime minister of the Hellenic Republic, said in an interview with Soviet television today.

Millions of people across the world saw how Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan shook hands with each other following the signing of the agreement to abolish intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. This agreement is the first step towards complete disarmament, Andreas Papandreou emphasized. We will soon be witnesses to the destruction by the two powerful military powers of the part of their arsenals. Reverting to a cold war, to amassing weapons of mass destruction will run up against immense resistance of the world public opinion today.

The Initiative of the Six, of which Greece is a member, works for putting into effect such measures as to cut back strategic armaments, abolish nuclear wepaons of the small range, outlaw nuclear tests, reduce conventional types of weapons, ban chemical weaponry, and jointly use space for exclusively peaceful purposes, the prime minister went on. We are of the opinion that all this is feasible. Our Initiative of the Six will join its voice to the voice of other forces committed to peace so as disarmament become a reality.

Soviet Envoy Utkin on Gorbachev NATO Remarks

TA151732 Ankara ANATOLIA in Turkish 1619 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Ankara (AA)—Soviet Embassy Under Secretary Yevgeniy Utkin has said that CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev's remark about NATO's southern wing being superior to Warsaw Pact forces in that area covered all NATO countries in the region and not only Turkey.

Speaking during a news conference held at the Soviet Embassy in Ankara, Utkin briefed correspondents on Gorbachev's speech on Moscow television.

In response to a question, Utkin said he did not understand why Gorbachev's remark prompted such strong reaction in Turkey.

Pointing out that in his statement Gorbachev meant all southern flank countries from Portugal to Turkey, Utkin said: In an extraordinary situation, NATO forces will not remain in Portugal but will be moved to the area of conflict. These will not be ground forces only, but will include naval and air forces as well. We do not believe that the U.S. 6th fleet will remain indifferent in such a situation. Moreover, U.S. bases in those countries should also be taken into account.

Recalling that there were reports about the United States keeping ready nine battalions of its Rapid Deployment Force, Utkin said: When we add all this up the superiority of NATO's southern flank cannot be denied.

Utkin noted that the power of Turkey, which possesses the second largest army within NATO, cannot be ignored. He added: I do not believe that the Turkish Armed Forces are organizationally outmoded. Great efforts are being made to modernize them.

Regarding Moscow radio's comments on NATO's southeastern wing, he said that the radio's commentaries did not necessarily reflect an identity of views within the Soviet Administration.

In reply to a question on how the additional deployment of forces to Incirlik air base would affect relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union, Utkin said: We have no information about a Turkish decision on this subject.

Utkin said that although relations between the two countries have developed normally and progress has been made in economic cooperation, relations have still not reached the desired level.

Latin America & Caribbean

Nicaragua's Ortega Announces Cease-Fire

LD170510 Moscow TASS in English 0505 GMT 17 Dec 87

[Text] Managua December 17 TASS—On Wednesday the Government of Nicaragua announced a unilateral cessation of the offensive operations of the Sandinista People's Army during the celebration of the Catholic Christmas of December 24-25.

This was announced here by the Republic's President Daniel Ortega.

If the contras do not respond to the call to cease fire and perform criminal actions against civilians on these days, they will be given a fitting rebuff, the president emphasised.

Touching upon the receipt of up-to-date F-5 aircraft by Honduras from the United States, Daniel Ortega pointed out that this upset the established military balance in Central America and put in jeopardy not only the national security of Nicaragua but the security of other countries of the region as well.

U.S. To Deliver F-5 Fighters to Honduras 17 Dec

LD161214 Moscow TASS in English 1135 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 16 TASS—A TASS diplomatic correspondent writes:

The first two F-5 fighter planes out of 12 promised will be delivered to Honduras on Thursday. The AP news agency reports today with reference to the Pentagon's official statement.

In diplomatic circles in Moscow it is noted that this step is fraught with a further heightening of the situation in Central America. It is generally recognized that without new American deliveries Honduras already has the mightiest and most up-to-date air force in the region and F-5 fighter planes will even more add to the existing imbalance.

Continued modernisation of the Honduran Army looks most unseemly now that the Central American countries have stepped on the path of compliance with the Guatemala accords providing for an end to the conflict and establishing in the region relations of friendship and cooperation. Moreover, a few days ago ministers of five Central American states agreed to hold negotiations on reduction of troops and arms control. The question of foreign military advisers, which has long been the stumbling block, is also on the agenda of the negotiations.

Supplying up-to-date fighter planes to Honduras, which has become a U.S. bridgehead in Central America, Washington at the same time accuses Nicaragua of "aggressive intentions". Thereby the American Administration, laying its

own fault at somebody else's door, is seeking to sow mistrust and suspicion between the neighbouring states, to undermine the process of peaceful settlement in the region.

The visit of Mikhail Gorbachev to the United States and the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Soviet and American Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles have opened up good prospects for new political thinking to set firm foot in international relations. One should like to hope that the new approach will also spread to regional problems also calling for undelayed solution. As to Central America, the Soviet Union and the United States are called upon to promote creation of conditions for successful furthering the Guatemala accords, in any case not to raise additional obstacles in their way.

CPSU Greets Martiniquais CP Congress

PM161135 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Dec 87 Second Edition p 2

[CPSU Central Committee message]

[Text] To the Ninth Communist Party of Martinique [PCM] Congress

The CPSU Central Committee sends fraternal greetings to the delegates to the Ninth PCM Congress and to all Martinique Communists and wishes the congress successful work.

The PCM, which recently celebrated a glorious jubilee—the 30th anniversary of its formation—is operating successfully in difficult and very distinctive conditions. While invariably adhering to Marxist-Leninist internationalist positions on the most important problems of the present day, Martinique's Communists are firmly defending the vital interests of working people and all the people of Martinique and are making an important contribution to the common struggle of communists and democrats in Latin America and the Caribbean for social progress, peace, and socialism.

In a rapidly changing world that is becoming increasingly integrated and interconnected, it is extremely important to strengthen the cohesion of all democratic and peace-loving forces in the struggle for peace and disarmament and to avert nuclear catastrophe. Martinique's Communists play an important and indispensable role in this struggle in their region.

Soviet Communists express their fraternal solidarity to the Communists of Martinique and wish them further success in the struggle for the vital interests of the Martiniquais people and for peace and social progress.

Long live the PCM!

Long live peace and socialism!

The CPSU Central Committee.

Political & Social

Public Dismay Over Yeltsin Affair Admitted

AU161341 Paris AFP in English 1336 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, Dec 16 (AFP)—A Moscow University professor Wednesday admitted that the dismissal of Moscow Communist Party chief Boris Yeltsin had caused widespread consternation among the public, but renewed accusations against the ousted official for "authoritarianism, avant-gardism and conservativism".

Professor Gavril Popov, writing in the weekly MOSCOW NEWS, said that he had been inundated with letters, telephone calls and questions about Mr. Yeltsin since publishing a first article on the Yeltsin case in the wake of the official's dismissal on November 11.

Mr. Yeltsin, who is currently in hospital with heart problems, was fired by a meeting of Moscow party officials, attended by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, for a host of reasons including "political immaturity".

His dismissal followed a closed-door meeting of the Communist Party Central Committee at which the outspoken supporter of the restructuring drive known as perestroyka had complained about the slow pace of change and the party's style of leadership.

Mr. Popov admitted that the Moscow party chief's removal had had "more serious" consequences because of the level of "glasnost", or openness, in Soviet society unprecedented since the Second World War. In these conditions, the "resignation" of Mr. Yeltsin took on "much broader social implications than the event itself".

The professor said that his mailbag contained letters expressing concern that the Moscow party chief's removal meant a "victory for the enemies of perestroyka", and that it was now "the end of perestroyka".

Mr. Popov attacked the ousted leader's methods, pointing out that if his replacement of Moscow officials had been allowed to continue, the country would face a situation similar to Stalin's purges in the 1930s.

The Yeltsin affair had highlighted "dangerous phenomena", namely that "avant-gardism has the support of a part of the masses", he said. "Many people in this country want perestroyka to be brought to them on a plate" without contributing to the reforms personally.

Mr. Yeltsin was guilty of authoritarianism because he believed perestroyka depended on the leadership and not on the grass-roots, avant-gardism for wanting to achieve perestroyka "in one or two bounds, leaving objective reality behind", and conservatism because his methods discredited perestroyka, thus serving the ends of the conservative opponents of the reforms.

Supreme Soviet Criticizes Electrical Ministry

LD152117 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 15 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The science and technology commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers discussed at a joint session issues connected with improving the quality of the electro-technical industry and with meeting the requirements of the national economy and the population.

[Correspondent V. Stepanyuk] The commissions which did study and analysis on the eve of the session, concluded that the Electrical Equipment Industry Ministry is far from being self-critical in assessing the results of its work.

For example, the ministry now has at its disposal a sound scientific potential of 123 scientific and research institutes and design offices, in which around 100,000 scientific workers, designers, and technologists work. However, the return from them in developing and introducing new technology is insignificant. In particular, the following fact has been quoted: [Begin commission leader O.A. Kaybyshev recording; identified from screen caption] With production output worth R16 billion, the ministry is able to sell for freely convertible currency production worth only $15 million. What a paradox! If the ministry thinks of bringing up to 97% of production to the world standard, then it cannot produce everything because it is impossible to bring everything up to the world standard. It is clear that it is necessary to get to this level in some local sections and to raise the standard of other articles due to the sales of this exported production. The ministry has so far not decided to do this. Moreover, we have an impression that they think that someone else will turn up and will suggests these solutions to them. [end recording]

[Stepanyuk] There are many things to think about. Half of the equipment has become obsolete in the industry enterprises, more than one-third of workers work manually and it is not surprising that, for example, batteries for household appliances and many other electrical goods are in chronically short supply.

[Begin V.A. Koptyug, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, recording] Many years later and already under its fourth minister, the ministry cannot, all the same, be described as being seriously interested in mastering the technical and technological solutions which correspond to the world standard. I researched information on the accelerator electrons story; the ministry itself uses and enjoys economic benefits from those accelerators, which were supplied via cable lines by the Siberian department and which were worth R300 million. The Siberian department wants to provide their production to other industries of the country. I would like to hand

this to you and to ask you to classify this as the deputies' question, to which the ministry should provide an answer. [Koptyug holds the report in front of the camera] [end recording]

[Stepanyuk] In their recommendations to the ministry the deputies consider it necessary to put into action all reserves, so that the practical and not formal transfer of the enterprises of the industry to full financial autonomy and self-financing will be ensured. Apart from this, the commissions submitted a proposal to the government to assist the ministry in technical re-equipment, in the provision of modern materials, and in meeting social requirements of the industry's workers.

Party Dismissals Reported in Volyn Obkom

AU161531 Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAINA in Ukrainian 8 Dec 87 p 3

[Report by S. Melnychuk, RADYANSKA UKRAINA correspondent, on a Volyn Obkom plenum: "Escaping From the Captivity of Stereotypes"—boldface as published]

[Excerpts] **To start with, here are a few entries from the chronicle:**

On 17 June 1987 the obkom bureau resolved to dismiss M.T. Kosenko from the post of Lutsk Gorkom first secretary for serious shortcomings in the control of the city party organization.

On 4 July the obkom plenum dismissed Z.S. Kovalchuk from the post of obkom first secretary for failure to cope with his duties. V. I. Zhybrov was dismissed from the post of obkom second secretary for serious shortcomings in his work.

On 5 December 1987 Ye.A. Polivanov was removed from the obkom bureau and relieved of the post of obkom secretary, in connection with his request for a job with a smaller range of duties.

In the meantime I.V. Postyulha, O.I. Stupakov, and A.M. Voytsekhovskyy, obkom department chiefs; and P.S. Melnychuk, Party Control Commission chairman, have been relieved of their duties; R.S. Chapyuk, Vladimir Volynskiy Raykom first secretary, and A.S. Druzyuk, Gorokhovskiy Raykom first secretary, incurred strict party penalties and were dismissed from their posts.

These are the gales and storms which have struck the "upper echelons" of Volyn party organization in recent times. L.I. Pavlenko, Volyn Obkom first secretary, had his reasons to say in the accountability report at the recent obkom plenum: "Examples have been set by H.S. Bereza, member of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and of the obkom bureau, and woman link leader at the Dzerzhinskiy Kolkhoz in Lutskiy Rayon; V.D. Stepanchuk, obkom member and diesel locomotive driver in Kovel station depot; Yu.D. Khmelevskyy, obkom member and team leader in specialized administration No 536 in Lutsk; K.T. Vashchuk, obkom member and chairman of the 25th CPSU Congress Kolkhoz in Gorokhovskiy Rayon; H.M. Pashchuk, obkom candidate member and team leader at the Novovolynsk Osnastka association..." In addition, L. I. Pavlenko mentioned several raykom secretaries who "persistently sought for effective forms of organizational and political work, non-stereotype attitudes toward the matter at hand." That was all. What about leaders who are able to organize and lead people behind them, able to fill entire branches of the national economy and important sectors of sociocultural life with new content, with new energies? Without them, without such leaders, it is difficult to accomplish appreciable changes for the better in any field, and the more so in restructuring.

The situation in Volyn Obkom bureau was complex or, more exactly, unwholesome, and this affected the activity of rayon and grass-root links. [passage omitted]

The plenum found the work performed by the obkom bureau in its control over restructuring to be inadequate. What inspired hope was the atmosphere, the orientation toward remedying the shortcomings. This—irrespective of all shortcomings, both those which have been overcome and those which still exist—is due to meet with a response in the field.

The plenum was addressed by S.I. Gurenko, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member and secretary, and attended by M.V. Tarasenko, instructor in the Organizational Party Work Department of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

Vladimir Obkom Plenum Addresses Glasnost

PM161123 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

[Special Correspondent N. Demidov report: "In the Light of Glasnost: Vladimir Party Obkom Plenum Has Discussed a CPSU Central Committee Resolution"]

[Text] Vladimir—As is well-known, the CPSU Central Committee has adopted a resolution entitled "On glasnost in the work of party and trade union organizations and soviet organs in Vladimir Oblast." Recently a Vladimir party obkom plenum discussed this important document and measures to fulfill it. The report was delivered by R.S. Bobovikov, first secretary of the CPSU obkom. Taking part in the plenum's work was V.N. Sevruk, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department.

Two key problems determine the fate of restructuring in the decisive phase—the democratization of all aspects of social life and the radical economic reform. All activity is now moving in the direction of constructive work for providing organizational and ideological backup for these key tasks. Thus, it is necessary to constantly

measure each step along the path of restructuring against public opinion and to learn how to live and work in conditions of democratization and glasnost.

The report noted that even though the atmosphere of truthfulness and openness in the oblast is becoming more stable, its further establishment requires the fundamental improvement of the style of party work and the development of all-around activeness on the part of all Communists. The plenum's preparation itself seemed to be an attempt to break the established stereotypes of overorganized discussions.

On the eve of the plenum the main themes of the report were examined at party raykoms and gorkoms in the oblast. Activists were polled. It is interesting that the overwhelming majority of those questioned noted that the development of glasnost in labor collectives is still inadequate. The same point was made in many letters addressed to the plenum by oblast inhabitants. The concrete facts and suggestions put to CPSU obkom workers still need to be thoroughly examined. For the time being I shall note one absolutely specific demand heard from the plenum platform and contained in citizens' appeals: That there must be more glasnost when transferring to the new forms of economic management.

There are more than enough grounds for alarm here. The pace of Vladimir Oblast's economic and social development is still slow. On the whole industry failed to make good the backlog which has been allowed to develop since the beginning of the year. The fulfillment of the Food Program's targets in the oblast is also unsatisfactory.

The new forms of economic management and the rapid dissemination of advanced experience and the achievements of science must ensure a radical breakthrough in the economy. Labor collectives must know how this work is progressing and must discuss ways of eliminating the shortcomings. Let us look at the problems raised from the standpoint of those who took part in the plenum—both those who spoke from the platform and those who were in the hall.

A. Sadovnikov, a repairman at the Vladimir tractor plant:

As of 1 January a further 75 industrial enterprises will join the 56 already working under the new conditions. But to be honest it is still not completely clear how the preparation is going, and that is the case at our plant, too. I did not speak at the plenum, but many speakers did express my thoughts on this matter. I was pleased that the discussion was frank and I would say freer and franker than before. And apart from some attempts at self-justification, which slipped into the debates, the discussion, in my view, was interesting.

The speech by T.Furina, an assembly worker at the Kovrovskiy plant named for V.A. Degtyarev, came to mind. That enterprise is preparing to switch to the new conditions of economic management and the shop where she works has already changed to progressive forms of labor remuneration. Yet Furina asked from the platform: What has actually changed in work organization and remuneration? And her answer was—virtually nothing. The same old rush work, a vast amount of overtime, the same old wage-levelling in material rewards. Objective factors are sought as justification: subcontractors are to blame, they say. Yet a considerable proportion of the blame rests on the collective itself. The potential offered by democratization and the right to self-management is still being poorly used.

T. Khonyakova, milkmaid at the Lenin Kolkhoz in Muromskiy Rayon:

The fact that the fulfillment of the Food Program's targets in the oblast remains poor can be easily explained by a visit to the stores. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes have a great deal of extra work to do. At the same time there are reserves which would ensure a rapid increase in output.

My husband, my son, and I leased a kolkhoz milking shed for 200 cows. It is true that some people—a replacement milkmaid and two cattlehands—have been helping us. Ten tonnes of above-plan milk have already been produced and milk yields continue to grow. In brief, this is necessary work, whichever way you look at it, but why is it not making progress in the oblast? I spoke openly about this at the plenum and could see that my opinion is shared by others. Indeed, what argument can there be? At the obkom recently there was a meeting with Communists working under the family contract. Do you know how many people of that kind they found in Vladimir Oblast? Just 13...

We are not asking for special conditions. We just need attention, that is all. The CPSU raykom knows about our results only from hearsay, no one comes here or inquires about what kind of support is needed. Instead, when the latest seminar or conference comes round, they telephone just before to say that they need a speech. But I say that what is needed is experience—please come and look, do not take me away from my work. But for some reason none of the leaders who took part in the debates at the plenum developed this idea or explained what will actually be done to disseminate the family contract.

Correspondent's Commentary [subhead]

Milkmaid T. Khonyakova's speech was probably the only one greeted with loud applause. That is no coincidence. She convincingly showed the significant results of resourceful work and at the same time the inertia that exists when a quite specific task is being resolved. It has reached the point that on pay day milkmaids from neighboring farms cast furtive glances at their friend as they try to work out how much she has earned. How

greedy she is, they say, she gets twice as much. But Khonyakova replies: Of course I am greedy, but only for work. That is the sort of abnormal climate that has been created around a useful innovation. Let us recall the words of the CPSU Central Committee resolution—the spearhead of glasnost and criticism must be aimed at achieving the final destruction of the braking mechanism and the eradication of bureaucracy, departmentalism, and local favoritism. And, at the same time, at giving all-around support to everything progressive which reinforces the socialist economy, ideology, and morality.

Local organs of management bear a great responsibility. Glasnost has still not become the norm in their work. Meanwhile, in reply to the poll question on which negative phenomena need to be publicized on a broader scale, one-half of those questioned named persecution for criticism and the use of official position for selfish purposes, while the overwhelming majority cited mismanagement. Democratization, grass-roots monitoring, reports by elected organs and their leaders, and open elections of leaders will help to eliminate these phenomena of stagnation.

V. Selivanov, first secretary of Suzdal CPSU Raykom:

In the past none of us heard the party obkom first secretary assess his own work. Now such a discussion has taken place. This also constitutes a report to elective organs.

But what does greatest harm to the cause? In psychological terms, many obkom members are still not ready for resolute restructuring and have not analyzed the CPSU Central Committee resolution for themselves so as to be absolutely clear where to begin and how to go on. A mood of false confidence still prevails: We can handle it, people say, we can cope. But you cannot rush it. The feeling at the plenum was that some leaders are simply not ready to work in the new way.

Party organizations in the oblast are now holding plenums and meetings of Communists featuring the reports of elective organs on the work of leading restructuring. We had just such a discussion here and quite a few useful and instructive comments were made. It is quite often the case, however, as the report pointed out, that many plenums and, in particular, meetings are held in the old way and are over-organized. People have still not abandoned stereotyped working or inertia. There should be more glasnost here, too, especially in the press.

Correspondent's Commentary [subhead]

The oblast press was the subject of a good few comments at the plenum. Dubious aspects in the activity of individual people are still being hushed up. For example, with the direct connivance of Yu. Kovyarov, former chairman of the Kolchugino Gorispolkom, one apartment in three in a new apartment block was allocated unlawfully. However, the local newspaper GOLOS KOLCHUGINTSA did not want to tell people in any detail why the ispolkom chairman had been sacked. This aroused citizens' justified criticism.

M. Malakhova, secretary of Vladimir CPSU Obkom, had harsh words to say about the oblast newspaper PRIZYV. She also noted that the editorial office is in a special position now. Yet the report spoke very mildly about its problems and tasks. Reports seemed to have become more interesting but the thrust of the criticism is not always constructive in character. Serious criticisms were levelled at the journal POLITICHESKAYA AGITATSIYA, there are few articles "based on real life," as speakers acknowledged, and reports are sometimes not worth reading.

Yet the oblast's mass information organs have topics to discuss. The aforementioned reports by leaders provide food for thought. For example, the report by local plant director A. Sudin was offered for discussion by the labor collective and the inhabitants of the "Krasnoye Ekho" settlement. People were severe in their evaluation of omissions in the preparations for winter but an opportunity was given to rectify the situation. People at the 1 May Glassworks expressed a lack of confidence in the director, M. Serebryakov. The workers did not forgive him his crudity or callousness.

B. Afonin, a lathe and drill operator at the Kovrovskiy Excavator Plant:

I can give you my impressions of the plenum in a few words: We need that kind of open discussion all the time, not only at oblast level but above all at the grassroots, in primary party organizations. That is where restructuring is going wrong. We were given a roundup of letters addressed to the plenum which were self-explanatory.

That is where the attention must be directed first and foremost—the primary party organizations.

Correspondent's commentary [subhead]

There are 2,300 primary party organizations operating in Vladimir Oblast. Strange as it may seem, after the report and election meetings which were held, satisfactory assessments were given to... virtually every last one. Even in those places where work was clearly disorganized and neglected.

During the preparation for the plenum primary party organizations sent in a large number of specific suggestions on improving the style of party work and they formed the basis of the measures designed to fulfill the CPSU Central Committee resolution. Measures have been taken to actively restructure the style of party work and assert a style of democratization and glasnost. The decisions of organs of power and management will be taken and implemented from these standpoints in the

future. But the resolution adopted by the plenum is only the beginning. Correct words must be turned into substantial deeds. That above all else is what the inhabitants of the oblast expect.

Moscow Obkom Plenum Proceedings Reported
PM161455 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Dec 87 Second Edition p 3

[Yu. Kazmin, A. Petrushov report: "Without the Former Passiveness: The Moscow CPSU Obkom Discusses the Bureau Report on the Leadership of Restructuring"]

[Text] Moscow—The Workers' Mandate to the Obkom [subhead]

It is possible to say that the entire oblast party organization was involved in preparations for the plenum. Prior to the plenum most members of the Moscow Obkom and senior officials of the apparatus visited primary party organizations and met with Moscow Oblast working people. In their conversations questions of how restructuring is progressing and what is hampering the acceleration of the socioeconomic development of rayons, cities, and labor collectives were openly discussed. At the same time the report theses were examined. All this has helped to broaden and concretize the debate at the obkom plenum. A selection of letters from Moscow Oblast which was submitted to the participants was an object lesson in glasnost and a workers' mandate. Here are a few excerpts:

"Why is it that many people at our "Nikonovskoye" State Pedigree Farm in Ramenskiy Rayon are not responsible for anything? The office is crammed with people but there is no one to do any work. Meanwhile livestock units are drowning in filth. At an open party meeting shortcomings were discussed for 3 hours, yet no decision was adopted. This is what restructuring looks like here."

"We are studying at the Reutov Secondary Vocational Technical School-90. We are hoping to become skilled workers but we have no practical lessons, we have little idea of how to operate machine tools with numerical program control. We have no practical work experience, we barely know what a plant looks like. Please help us to become the working class and to master our trade well."

More than 11,000 letters have arrived at the party obkom. They contain an exacting analysis of the work of party committees and soviet ispolkoms and concrete indications of where people are sidestepping the struggle for renewal and failing to pass the test of democratization and glasnost.

The report delivered at the plenum by V. Mesyats, first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Obkom, also noted self-critically that the necessary dynamism and depth has still not been achieved in the work of the obkom bureau. Hence, despite the fact that the oblast will overfulfill the 2-year targets for industrial output growth and fulfill the program for increasing the output of consumer goods, a considerable number of fundamentally important tasks in the intensification of industry and agriculture will not be fulfilled. There are also a number of acute problems in capital construction. The main reason for the slow progress lies in the political and organizational inertia of party committees and their leaders and a lack of initiative on their part. This manifests itself especially noticeably in the implementation of the radical economic reform.

Toward Full Economic Accountability [khozraschet]! [subhead]

It was stated openly in the report and the speeches that many party committees, including the obkom itself, are not ready for work in conditions of the reform of the economic mechanism. Specifically this was noted by G. Ivanovskaya, weaver at the "Proletarskaya Pobeda" factory:

"Self-financing and full economic accountability [khozraschet] are becoming a reality for hundreds of enterprises in the oblast. However the working people have little understanding of practical meaning of the new economic transformations. This is one of the serious omissions in the work of the bureau, its secretaries, and the entire obkom apparatus."

N. Khripunov, director general of the "Minudobreniya" association described the difficulties which beset preparations for work in conditions of the Law on the State Enterprise in his collective. According to his opinion, the main obstacle is the slow replacement of administrative methods by economic methods. Thus a state order continues to include old indicators although part of them are not backed up by raw material resources.

At this crucial time of the restructuring of the economy and the management sphere, the work of the sector and economic departments of the obkom must be particularly constructive. However, as was noted at the plenum, party leadership of the economy is still not free from "attempts to apply pressure." This is particularly characteristic of B. Balashov, obkom secretary responsible for the development of industry and transport. There is strong evidence of the stereotypes of pressure in his actions.

Sixty percent of the oblast's enterprises are switching to full economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing in the new year.

Plenum participants noted with concern that by no means all party committees, nor V. Novikov, the obkom secretary responsible for this sphere, are mastering quickly and skillfully enough the experience of coordinated leadership and introduction of economic methods in the practical work of all management components.

Moscow Oblast rural workers have been set the difficult task of producing 3 million tonnes of milk and selling the state a million tonnes of potatoes and a million tonnes of vegetables per annum. In order to cope with this task successfully it is necessary here too to tackle questions of economic accountability [khozraschet], self-capitalization, and self-financing with greater agility and flexibility. As distinct from industry, the collective and family contract has proved its worth in agriculture, and intensive techniques are producing high returns. This has produced a noticeable change for the better. The 2-year plan for the sales to the state of milk, meat, eggs, grain, and potatoes has been fulfilled ahead of schedule.

Vegetables, on the other hand are a different matter. A striking feature is also the great variance in the standard of performance and the rampant fluctuations in the results achieved. T. Fedosova, leader of a team of vegetable-growers at the Kolomenskiy Rayon "Leninskoye" Sovkhoz, who addressed the plenum seriously rebuked the oblast agroprom and the obkom sector department for their cool reaction to criticism. She said that this was not the first time that she has spoken out about the need for the comprehensive mechanization of this important sector, yet there are no changes. As in the past, large numbers of workers and students are called in to help with the vegetable harvest.

In their speeches K. Kunitskiy, director general of the "Ramenskiy" Agro-Industrial Complex, A. Ageyev, first secretary of the Leninskiy party raykom, and others backed the idea that the obkom bureau lacks persistence in the organization of party control in respect of the introduction of industrial methods of production, rational use of land resources, and the development of democratization in the rural economy. Sharp criticism was leveled at Obkom Secretary A. Shamonin, who is given to improvization and prone to snub leaders and specialists.

The course toward renewal demands of ideological cadres that they too should act more vigorously and assertively. The obkom bureau and secretariat have adopted a number of measures to restructure ideological, political, and educational work. Nonetheless, the ideological backup of restructuring is clearly lagging. V. Borisenkov, the obkom second secretary had to listen to much criticism addressed to him. And quite rightly so. The scum that is being washed up on the wave of restructuring—demagogues, windbags, and opportunists—is not being properly countered in the oblast.

Prestige and Trust [subhead]

The knot of problems in Moscow Oblast is complex. And unless every Communist, every worker is involved in the real cause, it will take a long time to untangle. The party has stated bluntly how this should be done, namely through democratization, through radical economic reform, through the new economic mechanism. All this is a necessity dictated by the times. In order to be able to cope with the demands of life, party committees, and first and foremost the obkom, must change their approaches, their style, and their methods.

For the sake of objectivity let us acknowledge that in assessing the work of the bureau as a whole and of each of its members individually, the rapporteur was strict and exacting. V. Mesyats's exacting words toward himself and his colleagues in the leadership rang out in the silence. Other plenum participants also expressed much principled—and let us say it—justified comradely criticism. The tone was set by the well-argued speech of Yu. Shogin, first secretary of the Zhukovskiy party gorkom. He disagreed with the rapporteur on the point that the obkom has an efficient cadre policy program. In his view there is merely a reserve list, a syllabus, and elements of a traineeship program, but a deeply thought-out system of work with cadres based on democratic principles still does not exist.

The mistakes made in the selection and nomination of leaders who subsequently had to be removed for immodest, greedy conduct or incompetence can only be explained by the absence of a vigorous, purposeful cadre policy which would accord with the tasks of restructuring. Or let us cite another fact. At meetings held in the oblast more than 550 people have been removed from party committees and bureaus, 109 party organization secretaries have been relieved of their duties, and the work of 24 elective organs has been judged unsatisfactory.

Many speakers noted that there is no real concern for the political and professional growth of elected cadres in the oblast, for rendering them practical assistance. This is what L. Lushkin, first secretary of Balashikhino Gorkom said in this context:

The obkom, getting carried away with the struggle against all kind of meetings and sessions, has virtually done away with the training of secretaries. Unjustifiably, such a very good method as trips and exchanges of opinion on the spot has been forgotten.

One of the reasons for the omissions in cadre policy, the speakers claimed, is the involvement of the obkom and its bureau in economic affairs. V. Levin, first secretary of the Mozhaysk party gorkom, rightly noted that obkom secretaries are setting a bad example when during harvest time they take on the bulk of day-to-day concerns. While agroprom leaders and specialists, playing a secondary role, are meanwhile as a rule collecting all kind of reports and information. Examples were cited where obkom personnel instructed gorkom and raykom secretaries to organize the reception of vegetables for storage and sign control targets for the sales of milk and meat.

Inevitably the question arises: Why is the bad practice of unjustified interference of party committees in the work of soviets so firmly established and goes at times as far as supplanting their functions? For one thing, there is of

course the soviet leaders' habit to constantly look over their shoulder and to wait for instructions. But another explanation was also cited at the plenum. Both at oblast and local level the party apparatus, even as regards purely economic questions, is much more numerous that the soviet apparatus. Thus, there are in the obkom sector departments for trade, the service sphere, and municipal services while there are no such departments at the ispolkom? Is this not the root of the supplanting of roles?

Engaging in petty tutelage of soviet and economic organs weakens the obkom's attention to political questions and socially significant phenomena in the economy and the social and spiritual sphere. Plunging into day-to-day economic concerns, many obkom officials have virtually removed themselves from the leadership of primary party organizations, that is, from the main concern.

Dwelling on the idea of the improvement of methods of leadership, A. Shabunin, first secretary of the Elektrostal party gorkom noted with regret that of late the work of many departments of the party obkom is marked by a telephonic style of work. This year alone they have demanded more than 40 verbal reports.

In this context many speakers spoke about the need to hold by-elections or otherwise replace members of elective party organs before their term is up. This is permitted this year in accordance with the CPSU Central Committee resolution on party committee and bureau review reports. In the view of the plenum participants, this opportunity should become the norm. This would make it possible to shed ballast in good time, to get rid of cadres who have compromised themselves, and to reinforce an atmosphere of confidence in party organs. It would also be more democratic if conferences at primary party organizations could be held with the permission of CPSU gorkoms and raykoms, rather than the obkom as is the case now. It would be expedient in the opinion of the plenum participants to submit these proposals pertaining to the democratization of party life for discussion by the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

The plenum of the Moscow CPSU Obkom was attended by Ye.V. Zaytsev, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Culture Department; V.P. Mozhin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Economic Department; and N.A. Zolotarev, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Party Organizational Work Department.

Kharkov Obkom Tackles Persisting Shortcomings

PM161221 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 11 Dec 87 p 2

[Own correspondent V. Zenkovskiy report under the "Restructuring: Practical Work and Problems" rubric: "Efforts Are Growing. But What About the Return? From a Plenum of Kharkov Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom"]

[Text] Kharkov—A Kharkov Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom plenum has discussed the bureau's report on the leadership of restructuring frankly, bluntly, and exactingly. After touching on the positive changes, the speaker, V. Mysnichenko, party obkom first secretary, and the participants in the debate devoted particular attention to a critical analysis of the state of affairs in the oblast.

A mere list of the party obkom bureau's measures and practical steps in the leadership of restructuring would take up many pages. These questions have been specially discussed at two obkom plenums and frequently at sessions of the bureau and the secretariat. Party gorkoms and raykoms, oblispolkom and gorispolkom leaders, chiefs of obkom departments, and the party committees and economic leaders of a number of associations, enterprises, and organizations have reported on the course of restructuring.

As we can see, a great deal of energy, effort, and time is being devoted to restructuring. But what is the return? As the speaker and the plenum participants pointed out, the measures being adopted do not, unfortunately, always produce the desired results. Many correct decisions hang fire at oblast and rayon level, do not become an action program at local level, and do not reach the labor collectives.

As for planning, this work has been well organized in the oblast. Industry entered the 12th 5-Year Plan with the "Intensification-90," "Quality," "Resources," and other comprehensive scientific and technical programs. The commitments specified not only the 5-year targets but also the ways and means of achieving them.

Yet by no means everything is being fulfilled. The contractual delivery shortfall in the second year of the 5-year plan is approximately R190 million. Plans for the manufacture of high-quality output, profits, and reducing prime cost are not being met. One in four enterprises is not coping with the basic technical and economic indicators. Laggard enterprises include such major plants as the tractor, electrical engineering, eighth bearing, tractor engines, machine tool building, and others.

Giving a critical assessment of the situation which has emerged, the speaker and the debate participants leveled a number of well-founded complaints at the ministries—in particular the USSR Ministries of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building, the Electrical Equipment Industry, and the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry—for the fact that they have not yet resolved the most important questions of their enterprise collectives' work under the new conditions. But they laid the main responsibility for the failures at their own door: the obkom bureau and secretaries, and the sector department chiefs. Also culpable are the party committees, which have not shown the requisite exactingness toward economic leaders and the technical, economic, and financial services during the transition to the state acceptance system, economic accountability [khozraschet], and self-financing.

But while listening to the speakers I recalled the obkom plenum which took place in this hall last April. That plenum too was marked by a great outpouring of criticism, in-depth analysis of problems, and strict accountability toward Communists who had perpetrated errors and blunders. I thought then that, in the wake of such a plenum, matters are bound to make drastic progress. But 8 months have now elapsed and the same plants are once again being named among the laggards—the tractor and electrical engineering, the eighth bearing, and the tractor engines plants. The delivery arrears have risen, not fallen. Targeted programs remain unfulfilled. Despite the severity of the punishment for overreporting and amending plans, this corrupt practice continues. In October, for instance, monitoring organs in Kharkov excluded more than 40,000 square meters of housing, a clinic, and a kindergarten from state accountability because they were being handed over with considerable imperfections.

Consequently, criticism alone, even the most pointed and principled, and analysis, albeit the most profound, are insufficient for radical restructuring. Vigorous actions are necessary. And there are not enough of them.

T. Belkina, fitter at the eighth bearing plant, lodged a serious complaint with the obkom bureau.

"I direct my reproach at the party obkom and gorkom bureaus and at K. Khirnyy, first secretary of Kharkov Gorkom, personally," she said. "Belated principledness in assessing the actions of the plant's former leadership have led to us gradually losing the best traditions, the dismissal of many skilled workers, and to our lagging behind in the renewal of production and in social development. I would like the obkom bureau to make a timely investigation of the needs and problems of the laggard collectives and not permit them to slide into the crisis situation experienced by our bearing plant."

Matters in the oblast are not improving because the edict-and-pressure methods of leadership continue to be applied. They are employed especially widely in construction, which has an extremely adverse impact on results. There are annual shortfalls amounting to tens of millions of rubles in contract work plans, and the achievements of scientific and technical progress are being introduced only slowly. One-half of the trusts are not coping with the plans at present, and many installations are being commissioned with major defects. Since the beginning of the 5-year plan some R33 million less than planned has been spent on the construction of housing and sociocultural amenities. Pondering the reasons for the serious lag in construction, V. Kazarinov, leader of a team of fitters with the first house-building combine, said:

"We very often see oblast, city, and rayon leaders at the construction site. The 'Volgas' roll up—this means there will be another staff and new instructions. Economic managers of all ranks have long since been discouraged from thinking creatively, making decisions independently, and working with initiative. The frequent reshuffles in construction largely occur as a result of this sort of leadership by party and soviet organs."

Team leader V. Kazarinov expressed to N. Skidan, party obkom secretary, K. Khirnyy, first secretary of Kharkov Gorkom, and A. Aleksandrov, secretary of Kharkov party gorkom, the pressing desire that they review the leadership methods of the construction sector.

It was stressed at the plenum that many errors and blunders had also been mentioned earlier. For instance, 8 months ago (at the obkom plenum which took place in April) serious shortcomings in cadre work were analyzed. The reference was to some leaders who had besmirched themselves with serious misdemeanors. Mention was made, for example, of major criminal proceedings against the oblast consumer administration and the "Kiyevskiy" garage cooperative. Criminal proceedings were instituted against a number of oblast, city, and rayon leaders, economic managers, and officials of the law-enforcement organs. These and other negative phenomena received a principled assessment from the obkom bureau. Not only the immediate culprits but also those people who failed to ensure proper control over the affairs of the relevant area were given strict party reprimands.

It seemed that this ought to have been a good lesson for leaders of all ranks. But this was not so—and this plenum too was again discussing the lack of integrity and the immodesty of individual Communist-leaders who are responsible for the fact that flagrant violations in the allocation of housing were committed in the oblispolkom and Kharkov Gorispolkom. Some workers provided with housing were granted apartments although they had not been in line. Strict party proceedings have been instituted by the obkom bureau against E. Lukashenko, first deputy chairman of the oblispolkom, and N. Timoshin, first deputy chairman of Kharkov Gorispolkom, G. Mikhaylov, secretary of the oblast trade union council, and other leaders.

There is also insufficient monitoring of the execution of the decisions being made. A. Bandurka, chief of the oblispolkom internal affairs administration, while noting the seriousness of the formulation of measures and decisions, drew attention to the fact that, because of feeble monitoring, it will not be possible to fulfill a single one of them completely. If the efficacy and fruitfulness of the decisions made are enhanced, restructuring will take greater strides.

The plenum set the task of deepening and accelerating restructuring in the material and spiritual spheres. Everything depends on the full implementation of correct, good decisions.

First Day of AUCCTU Plenum Reported

PM161631 Moscow TRUD in Russian 12 Dec 87 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Information Report on AUCCTU Plenum"]

[Text] The Second AUCCTU Plenum began its work in Moscow yesterday.

The plenum examined the question "On the Work of Primary Trade Union Organizations Under the New Conditions of Management and Self-Management." AUCCTU Chairman S.A. Shalayev delivered the report.

The plenum participants had been afforded an opportunity to familiarize themselves in advance with the theses of the AUCCTU report, as well as with a review of working people's letters on questions of restructuring in trade unions and with materials on the work experience of primary trade union organizations under conditions of economic reform and the democratization of production management.

Participating in the discussion of the report were V.G. Dybal, chairman of the trade union committee of the "Belavtomaz" Belorussian Production Association for the Production of Heavy Trucks; V.I. Romanov, chairman of Kemerovo Oblast Trade Union Council; B.V. Perevezentsev, leader of a teams of fitters and installers at the A.A. Zhdanov "Krasnoye Sormovo" Plant and chairman of the plant labor collective council; V.P. Shcherbakov, chairman of Moscow City Trade Union Council; I.N. Myagkov, chairman of the "Omskshina" Production Association's trade union committee; F.A. Prokopenko, senior rolling press operator in the sheet-rolling shop of the Novolipetskiy Yu.V. Andropov Metallurgical Combine and member of the combine's trade union committee; Kh. Alimova, chairman of the Uzbek Republic Trade Union Council; Hero of Socialist Labor A.P. Potapov, section chief of the "Vorkutaugol" Production Association's "Vorgashorskaya" Mine; V.K. Borodin, chairman of the Chemical and Petrochemical Industry Workers Trade Union Central Committee; D.P. Pritula, chairman of the trade union committee of Odessa's "Kislorodmash" Science-and-Production Association; N.K. Dolgushkin, secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee; A.K. Milt, chairman of the Estonian Republic Committee of the Textile and Light Industry Workers Trade Union; A.B. Kabanov, leader of a team of electricians and cablemen at the "Kostromaenergo" Regional Power Administration's Kostroma GRES and chairman of a shop committee; V.I. Korzhov, chairman of Leningrad Oblast Trade Union Council; Hero of Socialist Labor V.N. Pozdnyakov, chairman of the trade union committee of Pavlodar Aluminum Plant Named for the USSR's 50th Anniversary; I.I. Stroganov, general director of the "Uralmash" Production Association; A.Ya. Mikhaylov, trolleybus driver for Tiraspol Trolleybus Administration and chairman of the labor collective's council; M.V. Kuleshov, chairman of the Timber, Paper, and Wood-Processing Industry Workers Trade Union Central Committee; G.F. Moldovan, chairman of the Chervonoarmeyskiy Rayon Committee of the Rovno Oblast Agro-Industrial Complex Workers Trade Union; Hero of Socialist Labor I.KH. Aripov, chairman of the Tashkent No 1 House-Building Combine's trade union committee; V.B. Tikhonov, excavator driver at the "Sredazugol" Production Association's "Almalyk" Opencut Mine in Osh Oblast and trade union group organizer; R.A. Aslanyan, chairman of the trade union committee of the Armenian SSR's "Luys" Production Association; M.G. Pulina, assembler at the "Krasnodarskiy ZIP" Production Association and shop committee chairman; A.D. Boyko, chairman of Kharkov Oblast Committee of the Heavy Machine-Building Workers Trade Union; A.K. Zitmanis, chairman of the Latvian Republic Trade Union Council; and N.D. Tsikorev, chairman of Orel Oblast Trade Union Council. Plenum participants supplemented the speeches with specific remarks and suggestions directly from the auditorium.

The plenum adopted a resolution on the question discussed.

The plenum adopted an AUCCTU statement in connection with the signing of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles.

The plenum approved the composition of an AUCCTU commission to prepare proposals for improving the structure of trade unions.

These AUCCTU commissions were formed: for social questions, for mass production and economic work, for questions of labor legislation and legal work by trade unions, for educational work and the organization of leisure, for work among young people, for questions of organizational work and self-management, and the budget commission.

Yu.I. Ryzhov, chief of a sector of the CPSU Central Committee Organizational Party Work Department, and leaders of ministries and departments participated in the plenum's work.

The AUCCTU plenum will continue its work today.

The plenum materials will be published in the newspaper's next few issues.

Kiev Conference Tackles Nationality Problems

AU111425 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 4 Dec 87 pp 1-2

[RATAU report on a republic-level scientific theoretical conference in Kiev: "Along the Line of Restructuring Under the Banner of the Great October"]

[Excerpts] As reported, a republic-level scientific theoretical conference dedicated to the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and of the establishment of Soviet rule in the Ukraine was held in Kiev recently under the title: "Along the Line of Restructuring Under the Banner of the Great October."

The opening speech was delivered by V.V. Shcherbitskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary.

G.L. Smirnov, director of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism under the CPSU Central Committee and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, delivered a report entitled "The Historical Experience of the October, and Restructuring." [passage omitted]

In addition to plenary sessions, the conference was working in six problem groups. They examined topical questions concerning the development of Marxist-Leninist theory, critically assessed the state of social science research in the republic, and outlined ways to invigorate the part of scientists in the scientific provision of restructuring. [passage omitted]

The problem group dedicated to "the ideological and intellectual bases of social progress under the conditions of developing socialism" focused its main attention on topical problems concerning the development of the languages spoken by socialist nations, interrelations among national cultures of the USSR peoples, and the utilization of the cultural heritage of the past. The speakers pointed out that conditions necessary for developing all national languages had been provided in the Soviet Union. However, the mechanism of hindering has also manifested itself in this sphere. The participants actively discussed the problem of developing bilingualism, and emphasized the importance of the Russian language as a means of international communication. The conference participants moved to work out and to implement a comprehensive program for sociolinguistic research into the language situation in the republic.

The speakers emphasized that it was important to more actively study, and to use for educational purposes, the cultural heritage of the past. The need to apply the most recent achievements of literary criticism and linguistics in the practice of teaching was noted. The speakers also addressed the question of publishing some works of pre-October and Soviet literary classics.

The speakers who took the floor in the group dedicated to "The Great October and the development of nationality relations" were unanimous in their high appraisal of the role played by the Communist Party in settling the nationality problem, and in fostering friendship and cooperation among the USSR peoples. However, the achievements in this sphere do not at all signify that the present development of nationality processes in the Soviet Union is devoid of problems. The main thing is to be aware of the emerging aspects and facets of nationality relations, and to look for and to give timely, correct answers to questions brought forward by life.

The scientists self-critically admitted that, in their theoretical thought, experts in social sciences were far behind the practice of nationality relations. They also emphasized the need to coordinate efforts in elaborating problems concerning relations among nationalities, and to widen access to social information and statistics. Particular attention was paid to the role played by the knowledge of history in the international education of the Soviet people, and primarily of youths. A sharp dispute flared up in connection with the need to more precisely define the concepts and categories which characterize relations among nationalities and the development of socialist nations. [passage omitted]

Participating in the conference proceedings were: Yu.N. Yelchenko, B.V. Kachura, A.A. Titarenko, V.S. Shevchenko, S.I. Gurenko, Yu.A. Kolomiyets, and V.D. Kryuchkov, members and candidate members of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee; V.G. Urchukin, Ukrainian Council of Ministers deputy chairman; G.I. Revenko, Kiev Obkom first secretary; K.I. Masik, Kiev Gorkom first secretary; L.M. Kravchuk and F.M. Rudich, department chiefs in the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

Georgian Premier Interviewed on Rail Crash

PM151505 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Dec 87 Second Edition p 6

[Interview with O. Cherkeziya, chairman of the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers, by correspondent G. Lebanidze, under the rubric "Details": "The Lessons of the Disaster"—place and date of interview not given; first paragraph published in boldface italics]

[Text] **PRAVDA already reported that a railroad accident occurred along the Gardabani-Beyuk-Kyasik section at 0335 hours Moscow time on 29 November this year. A goods train ran through a red signal and into the rear of the No 905 Tbilisi-Baku mail and passenger train. Thirty persons died and 66 suffered varying degrees of contusion and injury as a result of the disaster.**

Georgian SSR—While I was at the scene of the disaster, looking at the heap of twisted metal, talking with the injured and the families and friends of the dead, and studying voluminous documents, I was constantly nagged by the thought: After all, this need not have happened if only.... This "if only" was the subject of a conversation with O. Cherkeziya, chairman of the government commission investigating the causes of the disaster—which ended its work a few days ago—and chairman of the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers.

Correspondent: Tragedies like this are attributable neither to the elements nor to nature's nasty tricks. They do not happen out of the blue. As a rule, they are preceded by a lengthy process of "accumulation" of shortcomings, errors, and blunders resulting from irresponsibility, lack of discipline, negligence, sloppiness, window dressing,

and false reporting. These are the factors creating objective conditions for all sorts of misfortunes. Of course, the drama that we are talking about would not have occurred if only the leadership of the USSR Ministry of Railways and the Transcaucasian Railroad and the railroad's party and trade union organs had not grown accustomed to and had not tolerated the muddle and irregularities which, for so many years on end, have been a sign of the railroad staff's complacency. If only the railroad's leadership and party committee had not acted as if restructuring had nothing to do with them, but had promptly drawn conclusions from the 10 September 1987 discussion by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo on the causes of the collision between trains at Kamenskaya Station on the Southwestern Railroad and the corresponding Georgian Communist Party Central Committee resolutions on questions of train traffic safety. The railroad's operations have on many occasions been criticized by mass media, including PRAVDA. Meanwhile, matters went no further than halfhearted measures and "routine" dressing down, with simply no far-reaching changes taking place. The pledges given by the USSR Ministry of Railways on the bilateral decision by the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee and the ministry to provide effective assistance to the Transcaucasian Railroad in order to improve its operations are still hanging in the air.

O. Cherkeziya: Following the government commission's comprehensive investigation and discussion of reports by leaders of the USSR Ministry of Railways and the Transcaucasian Railroad and by MVD and Prosecutor's Office organs, it was established that the main cause of the accident which occurred—as you correctly noted—was the lack of proper order and discipline on the railroad. G. Maysuradze, the railroad's deputy chief for traffic safety, failed to display proper demandingness and principledness toward his subordinates, everything boiled down to paper shuffling and [formal] penalties, and these were used like a shield to cover everything up. Surely, the ineffectiveness of the educational aspect of penalties is proved by the fact that up to 2,500 disciplinary penalties were imposed on traffic service workers during the first 10 months of this year, more than 300 of which were in respect of absenteeism. Penalties were imposed on 156 workers at the Tbilisi-Sortirovochnaya Locomotive Depot. Edicts and reprimands on paper took the place of profound and purposeful education.

Correspondent: Nevertheless the instances of irresponsibility and lack of discipline did not diminish. Ultimately, they evolved into tragedy.

O. Cherkeziya: Let's go no further than the fact that track maintenance workers, having replaced the tracks along the Gardabani-Beyuk-Kyasik section, "forgot" to weld the track joints in place. On the day in question, this produced a brief break of track continuity and a false light signal halting the traffic. This caused trains No 2001 and No 2003 to halt, one after the other, along the section. They were soon joined by No 905 Tbilisi-Baku mail and passenger train. The dispatcher sent yet another freight train, No 2005, "chasing" after it. It was driven by a locomotive team from the Tbilisi-Sortirovochnaya Depot consisting of engineer Ye. Dzhioyev and his assistant S. Bluashvili. The train, weighing 2,400 tonnes, went through the red warning signal at a speed of 50 km per hour and ran into the rear of the stationary train in front of it. The investigation proved conclusively that the disaster was caused by the criminal negligence of the engineer and his assistant who had fallen asleep on the job.

Correspondent: It is well known that, in conformity with a recent order by the USSR Ministry of Railways, all locomotives should have been fitted with updated safety devices.

O. Cherkeziya: "Should have been..." The point is that Dzhioyev's locomotive (as well as many other electric locomotives, as an inspection showed) was not fitted with these new devices even though Yu. Kapanadze, chief of the railroad's locomotive pool, "reported" compliance with the order to the ministry while A. Khechoyan, deputy chief of the railroad's locomotive pool, failed to obey the order regarding the withdrawal of older locomotives from service.

Correspondent: It is well known that the railroad's Tbilisi Division has not created the proper work and relaxation conditions for locomotive team members. At the same time, each team has clocked an average of 513 hours of overtime during the first 10 months of this year. Is this permissible?

O. Cherkeziya: No, of course not. The engineer had clocked... 108 hours of overtime in November without taking any days off, while his assistant had clocked 790 hours during the first 11 months of this year. Main responsibility for these and other similar breaches of labor legislation and work regime lies with the Railway Transport Workers Trade Union Railroad Committee and its Chairman R. Bugianishvili.

Correspondent: The misfortune has also thrown light on other shady aspects of the railroad's operations.

O. Cherkeziya: Yes, the volume of freight transportation has declined this year. The railroad is suffering major losses through breaches of operational rules and substandard maintenance of equipment. Compared with last year, the number of refusals to take locomotives out has risen by a factor of 2.3, railroad track damage incidents have risen by a factor of 1.6, and electric power supply failures have risen by a factor of 1.3. Just like before, serious shortcomings are tolerated as regards the technical maintenance of passenger cars. Quite often they are sent out with defects, while a large number of them are due to be written off. This year, the overall grading of the railroad track's technical condition has fallen by one-half. Over 180 km of track are in an unsatisfactory condition, and this leads to the imposition of speed

limits for trains. Delays in the development of stations and of locomotive and car pools are the cause of the failure to produce the expected results from the laying of twin tracks.

Correspondent: It is well known that extreme situations in particular bring human qualities to light. As a rule, evil is countered by good, by compassion. There were so many truly heart-rending pictures to be observed during that tragic night! We need not go any further than, for example, the fact that a soldier, having dragged himself from beneath the wreck, his collarbone broken, used his last remaining strength to reach a telephone and report the calamity....

O. Cherkeziya: It can be boldly stated today that there would have been considerably more victims had it not been for the selfless and efficient actions by Transcaucasian servicemen, military and civilian medical personnel, and militia staffers. The evacuation of victims to hospitals in the cities of Gardabani, Rustavi, and Tbilisi was completed within 1 hour. Major assistance in the organization of salvage work was provided by leading republican officials and soviet and party officials from Gardabani, Rustavi, and Tbilisi who arrived here. All the relatives of victims who arrived in the Georgian capital were considerately welcomed, housed in hotels free of charge, and given material assistance. The USSR Ministry of Railways funded the reimbursement of the cost of lost personal property.

The victims and their families and friends derived great moral and mental support from the profound condolences expressed by the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers. [end Cherkeziya]

The question of the crash was examined a few days ago by the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau, with Minister of Railways N. Konarev present. The government commission's report was profoundly and comprehensively discussed. It was deemed inappropriate for Transcaucasian Railroad Chief Z. Papava to remain in office. The question of his party status will be examined after his recuperation. G. Maysuradze, deputy chief of the railroad, and Yu. Kapanadze, chief of the railroad's locomotive pool, were dismissed from office and expelled from the party. Severe party penalties were imposed on Railroad Deputy Chiefs V. Batsikadze, A. Khechoyan, and L. Berdzenishvili; R. Bugianishvili, chairman of the Railway Transport Workers Trade Union Railroad Committee; and upon V. Chubinidze, secretary of the Railroad Administration party committee, and it was deemed inappropriate that the last should remain in office. The Tbilisi Party Gorkom was instructed to look into the question of party responsibility by Communists working in the Administration and the Transcaucasian Railroad Tbilisi Division and involved in the crash.

The bureau outlined an extensive program to improve the railroad's operations. Criminal proceedings have been instituted against specific culprits.

Independent Journalists Union Founded

AU121615 Paris AFP in English 1525 GMT 12 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, Dec 12 (AFP)—Participants at an unofficial international seminar on human rights Saturday founded the first independent journalists' association in the Soviet Union in recent years, the group's initiator Sergey Grigoryants told AFP.

Mr. Grigoryants, the chairman of a workshop on the press during the five-day event, said that he and other journalists working for the Soviet Union's unofficial journals had decided to form a Western-style trade union independent of the Communist Party, and would seek to register with the authorities.

Their association is already negotiating to join the Brussels-based International Federation of Journalists, of which Mr. Grigoryants is a member. It would be the first journalists' union in Eastern Europe to be affiliated to the international federation, Mr. Grigoryants said.

Mr. Grigoryants is editor of the unofficial review GLASNOST which has spear-headed the recent movement of dissident publications. Observers noted that in the past, authorities have refused to acknowledge requests from dissident groups seeking recognition.

At least 20 independent journals have sprung up in the conditions of "glasnost" or openness in Soviet society in the last 33 months since Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev came to power.

Many are edited by former political prisoners like Mr. Grigoryants. The independent journals are samizdat-style newspapers with a circulation varying from 10 to over 100 copies. But Mr. Grigoryants' journal reaches a wider readership through translations in the West.

The human rights conference was this weekend continuing in private Moscow apartments, after Soviet authorities refused premises for the event and prevented Thursday's opening session from being held in a privately-booked banquet hall.

KOMMUNIST's 18th Issue Previewed

PM170939 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Dec 87 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Dialectics of New Thinking"]

[Text] This is the title of the editorial article [redaktsionnaya statya] which opens the latest, 18th issue of the journal KOMMUNIST. The article is devoted to the publication of M.S. Gorbachev's book "Restructuring and New Thinking for Our Country and the Whole World."

In the section "Acceleration and Restructuring: Theory and Practice" various aspects of the party and economic work being done in Sumy Oblast are examined. I. Grintsov, first secretary of Sumy Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom, contributes the article "Addressing a Living Cause." A conversation which took place at a "roundtable" session in Sumy's M.V. Frunze Machine-Building Science-and-Production Association is devoted to problems of introducing full economic accountability [khozraschet].

In publishing the letters review "Time of Concrete Deeds, Time of Concrete Responsibility" the editors invite readers to participate in a correspondence "roundtable" on a wide range of problems of party building and the further democratization of the party and society. This discussion is devoted to the upcoming 19th All-Union Party Conference.

The section "October and the Modern World" carries notes by V. Bushuyev and N. Maslennikov "Entering Upon a New Time"—on the meeting of representatives of parties and movements who participated in the celebration of Great October's 70th anniversary. The article "Revolution That Changed the Course of History" by W. Kashtan, general secretary of the Communist Party of Canada, and the article "October and Democracy" by G. Farakos, member of the Communist Party of Greece Central Committee Politburo, are carried.

The rubric "Debate and Discussion" is represented by scientists' replies to the editors' questions on problems of juridical science and practice under conditions of restructuring, as well as by the article "Ownership in the System of Socialism's Production Relations" by V. Dementyev and Yu. Sukhotin and a synopsis of materials on this subject published in the journal KOMMUNIST ESTONII.

Problems of the pace of socialist building are examined in an article by O. Latsis devoted to the 60th anniversary of the 15th party congress. Materials of the "Choice of Path" "roundtable" held in Frunze by the editorial boards of the CPSU Central Committee journal KOMMUNIST, the MPRP Central Committee journal NAMYN AMDRAL, and the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee journal KOMMUNIST KIRGIZSTANA are also carried under the rubric "Pages of History."

The rubric "Ideology, Culture, Morality" is represented by V. Baranov's article "The Writer's Destiny in the Country's Destiny" and by actress O. Ostroumova's monologue "Charm of Illusion."

Critical and bibliographical materials are published, including a review of an anthology of Comrade Deng Xiaoping's speeches.

Veteran Argues Importance of Malaya Zemlya

PM261331 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Nov 87 Second Edition p 3

[Article by M. Trubchannikov under the rubric "Reader Replies To Reader": "The Big Truth About Malaya Zemlya"; first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] The many readers who responded to the article "The People Will Tell the Truth" (PRAVDA 23 July) were not indifferent toward the question which its author was asked: "Don't you think that too much attention was formerly paid to the wartime episode at Malaya Zemlya? Is the episode all that important in the history of the Great Patriotic War?" Despite the fact that the article provided an answer, PRAVDA readers are continuing to hotly discuss this topic. The editorial board asked Mikhail Mikhaylovich Trubchannikov, a Muscovite and veteran, a marine during the war, one of the first to land at Myskhako, seven times wounded but unkillable, presumed dead by everyone, to express his thoughts on their letters. There is scarcely any other living person better qualified to tell the truth about Malaya Zemlya.

I am not a strategist and I am not a military historian, I am an ordinary participant in the battles for Novorossiysk. And it is from the viewpoint of an ordinary soldier that I want to express my views on the matter. So first of all I will cite a letter from M.A. Kalkinskiy of Kiev: "Was it really that important to the soldier in the trench what sector (crucial or secondary) he was in? When it comes to the importance of a particular engagement, to the trench soldier, to the junior officer it is of no significance: Death was always close at hand. And they fought for every little hill..."

For that very reason I support—unreservedly and unequivocally—former front-line scout I.T. Stashevskiy (Rodinskoye, Donetsk Oblast). He is right: "I must say that the question posed in the article about Malaya Zemlya is a provocative one. This must be understood right away." V.M. Bakhtin of Krasnoyarsk says the same. One might ask: But why provocative? Because the person who posed the question was thinking not about the soldiers who died at Malaya Zemlya, not about the maimed survivors, but about, to put it bluntly, the unwholesome, opportunist ballyhoo which developed over Malaya Zemlya. Such questioners are interested not in the fate of thousands of people, but only in the fuss about the name of 18th Army Political Department Chief L.I. Brezhnev, about his decorations after the war, and about the extolling of his role in the war, which overshadowed the real exploits of the defenders of Malaya Zemlya. Under him, they say, Malaya Zemlya was blown up out of all proportion, so after him it can be forgotten, crossed out. This viewpoint is bluntly and unequivocally expounded by K.N. Vinogradskiy of Kremenchug. I quote: "The assault landing operation to capture the bridgehead in the vicinity of Myskhako was one of the most unsuccessful in the history of the Great

Patriotic War.... Yet it was publicized and propagandized." And the letter ends as follows: "Had it not been for the former chief of the political department Malaya Zemlya would not get a mention. That's the truth!" The writer underlined the last three words. And he put an exclamation mark.

A letter signed N.N. Ivanov (Moscow) is severer still. Painful though it may be, one has to quote again: "Yes, I agree that the mass heroism of the infantry, sailors, and members of assault landing forces deserves more. But, you know, the heroism was not necessary, the Malaya Zemlya landing was not necessary..." I will not quote any more, I simply cannot. Apparently, the deaths of my friends were in vain and we fought to no purpose, there was nothing to fight for. So it was an insignificant, unfortunate episode.

I know such people not only from letters. I have met them in person. Gleefully rubbing their hands, they would send for pulping not only a booklet on Malaya Zemlya, but also the lives of many thousands of people. Is that not blasphemy?

The worst of it is, the most disturbing and most serious thing is (I cannot even find the right words) that people are responding to this impulse. I have heard that they have started, on the quiet, to close museums devoted to the 18th Army; instead of removing superfluous portraits of a single person and showing the real mass heroism; instead of opening museums devoted to every army that operated on the front; irrespective of who the political department chief or commander was; instead of writing good, truthful books about the defenders of the hundreds of Malaya Zemlyas in the Soviet land.

There are people who, having criticized someone for allegedly devising military operations with the aid of a globe, have, to put it mildly, the audacity themselves to assess people's courage, valor, and steadfastness from a purely strategic military and global standpoint. Imagining themselves to be great strategists, they trot out their assessments in an incredibly casual way: That operation was mishandled, you see, and this one was totally unnecessary.

Here is what P.I. Omelina (Serbina), 255th Taman Marine Brigade Medical Company Komsomol organizer, wrote in this connection: "Malaya Zemlya is steeped in blood, like any other place in our homeland where the fascists set foot... Anyone who claims today that Malaya Zemlya was a trivial episode is guilty of blasphemy."

Well, let us consider the word "episode." Let us go along with the "strategists" and look at the map of the military action. In fall 1942 the Hitlerites stormed Novorossiysk with several crack divisions. If the enemy forces had managed to take the city and port completely they would have been able to ferry troop reinforcements and ammunition across to the North Caucasus and bring out grain, livestock, and oil in the same way. But the plans would not be implemented. For the sole reason that it—the Soviet land—was held by Soviet people. They were too busy to consider whether it was a significant sector of the front or not, whether they shouldn't give it up to the enemy and save their skins...

Now let us talk about "episodes," looking not at the map but looking dead friends in the eye. I often dream of them. And I look them in the eye.

"Episode" one. Fighting a street battle, the group of assault troops broke through to a building and took up defensive positions there. A fire broke out in the building. Ammunition was running out. They had to break out. But how? "Farewell, comrades!" Junior Sergeant Mikhail Kornitskiy, a Communist, rose to his feet. "I'll blaze the trail for you." He tied a string of grenades around his bloodstained shirt, clambered onto the wall, and leapt into the enemy soldiers' midst. The explosion flung them in every direction. The wall was breached. The assault troops escaped through the hole.

Another "episode." About Ivan and Mariya. About their undying love. Junior Lieutenant Ivan Pavlishchuk was fighting off an entire company of fascists. The machinegun fell silent. The mortars ceased. The last submachinegun magazine was empty. Only then did he pull back. He was wounded.

Mariya Andronnikova, a nurse, dashed over to Pavlishchuk: "Vanya!" Everyone in the detachment knew they were deeply in love. "Can you stand, Vanya?" She dragged him. She had almost reached the safety of the trench. But a submachinegun burst felled him and her as well. That is how they were found. The giant Ivan and Mariya shielding him with her body. They were buried together in the same grave.

Yet another "episode." A tiny one, from the strategic viewpoint. About the miracle which ensured that I lived to write these lines. We had captured an enemy pillbox. There were 18 of us. It was midnight. It was time rejoin the unit. We had just stepped out when we encountered a solid wall of gunfire. We had to take refuge in the pillbox again. We stayed there for 3 whole days. How many attacks we beat off I cannot remember. It ended with their bringing up a "Ferdinand" mortar. One shot, two, three... The door was smashed. A high-explosive shell exploded inside the pillbox. The ceiling caved in. I prodded myself. Everything seemed to be intact. A grenade was lobbed in through the gaping hole in the door, it spun like a top on the floor. I grabbed it and threw it back. I crawled into the far corner of the pillbox. There were more explosions. The pain brought me round. But I did not open my eyes, I was slumped in the corner, motionless. I dimly remember someone grabbing my head and beating it against the wall. Then they let me drop, presumably thinking me dead. I came to again—because of the acrid smoke and fumes. Everything was on fire. Wood panels, dead bodies, clothing... Not a living soul. I crawled from one to the other, feeling my

comrades. Apparently, I was the only one left alive. I crept slowly out of the pillbox, and rolled around the ground to stop my clothes smoldering. I was just getting my breath back when a powerful explosion rendered me unconscious once again. I regained consciousness. I looked around, started to feel myself. My left foot was a bloody pulp. My right boot looked as if a a cow had been chewing it. I dragged myself along on my back. I lost consciousness and then dragged myself along some more. I took a few gulps out of a flask I came across. It was rum, though, not water. I kept passing out and regaining consciousness. I collapsed and came to in a cellar somewhere. Apparently, I had been dragged there by some of our troops. For 3 days I lay in the cellar. Then hospital. They started to patch me up. It was hard work, but they did it.

After Victory I went to Novorossiysk and saw my name on one of the obelisks there. There you have it... Why am I writing about this? There is nothing to shout about. Out of the 18 I alone survived. In one of hundreds, thousands of pillboxes. What significance did it have in terms of the battle as a whole, the sector as a whole, the front? None, if one's view of the war is based on geographical and military maps. But for me as a soldier? I do not even know how to express it in words. That pillbox was my death, that pillbox was my life. That pillbox is a monument to my dead comrades. That pillbox is my dreams.

If only I was alone... But, in fact, every soldier who has survived has his own pillbox, his own trench, his own nameless hill, his own crossing... Put them all together and you have the fate of the people in the war. Think about it. The memory of the dead must be honored. The big truth about the war must be recognized. It cannot be replaced by some short-term view of a situation. The article "The People Will Tell the Truth" is right when it says: "The short-term view, even in the good sense of the word, is something short-lived, ephemeral. It lasts a matter of years at the outside. But the memory of the people's exploit is immortal and everlasting."

New War History Will Fill 'Objective Need'

PM031051 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Dec 87 First Edition pp 2-3

[Article by Candidate of Military Sciences Lieutenant General S. Radziyevskiy: "The War of All the People: On the Preparation of the Fundamental Work 'The Soviet People's Great Patriotic War'"]

[Text] The decision to produce a 10-volume historical work under the title "The Soviet People's Great Patriotic War" is of special social importance and particular ideological and political significance in the conditions of the restructuring that has begun in the country. The time is ripe to take another qualitatively new step in the development of historical research and, thereby, to ensure that the content of that research corresponds to the spirit and scale of the transformations and major social changes in our country. There is also an objective need for a new work on the Great Patriotic War.

Many books have been published in our country on various periods of the war and its major battles and operations—scientific research, reminiscences, and artistic works. But the main works were published a long time ago. The well-known six-volume work "The History of the Soviet Union's Great Patriotic War, 1941-1945," for example, was published over 20 years ago.

There is another argument in favor of a new work. The desire to show not an objective and full picture of the war but the most favorable episodes of the successful struggle often produced a distorted picture of the war as a complex double-edged process and of the true scale of the calamity which befell the country at the beginning of the war. The inaccurate account of historical facts and the distorted evaluation of them gives rise to legitimate questions today: Why did the Red Army retreat so far in the first period of the war and why, in that same period, was the enemy able to accomplish his plans?

There were elements of a subjective and opportunist approach to the account of the history of the Great Patriotic War. Some events, sometimes of the greatest importance and significance for the course and outcome of the war, were represented in an oversimplified way. Others were ignored. Yet others were described in excessive detail. Emphases were shifted and the real picture of the past was distorted... For example, at various times operations which were not of decisive significance for the fate of the warring sides were placed virtually on a par with the battles for Stalingrad and the Kursk salient. There is in fact a moral principle linking them—the heroism, courage, and patriotism of Soviet people. It is necessary to make that point unreservedly and to give an historically truthful operational and strategic assessment of events.

Recent party decisions which were reflected in the documents of the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum, the 27th party congress, and subsequent plenums, and the assessments and conclusions in M.S. Gorbachev's report at the ceremonial session in the Kremlin to mark the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution are of tremendous significance for the development of Soviet historical science. Hundreds of new documents which reveal the dynamics of the preparation for World War II and fascist Germany's attack on the Soviet Union are becoming available to researchers. This is very important for us because it clarifies the true causes and mechanism of the origin of World War II and provides a fuller picture of Nazi Germany's naked aggression.

A vast quantity of documents, publications, and research studies, including work by foreign authors, convincingly confirm the involvement of British, French, and U.S. imperialism in the material preparation of the German

economy for a war of aggression. But only a part of those documents were publicized at the trial of the main Nazi criminals at Nuremberg in 1946.

We know that the idea of creating a collective security system, which the Soviet Union proposed in 1939, was not supported by the capitalist states' ruling circles. This finally freed fascist Germany's hands. The opening volumes of the 10-volume work plan to give an account of all the diplomatic, military, and military-technical measures carried out by the party and the government to protect the security of the USSR's borders. They also show how the Soviet Union managed to delay the military confrontation with Germany in 1939 and then used that delay to prepare to repulse the aggression.

During that period positive results were achieved in equipping the USSR Armed Forces with advanced hardware, developing military theory, and improving servicemen's military training. But major mistakes were also committed at that time—which had a tragic effect on the character and results of military operations at the beginning of the Great Patriotic War. Unjustified repressions destroyed a large part of the Red Army's command and political staff and had an adverse effect on the level of troop management in the first days of the war: After all, the people who died took with them their fruitful ideas, schemes, and innovative methods of conducting armed struggle. All these things, the product of the experience of troop exercises and combat operations, were paid for in blood and human losses...

All this happened and must not be forgotten. But the shortcomings in the preparation to repulse fascist Germany's aggression must be described without sensationalism or undue emotion—what is needed is strict objectivity and a thorough understanding of the characteristics of the time, the place, and the circumstances.

There are many questions related to the activity of the General Headquarters and the personality of Supreme Commander I.V. Stalin. The negative aspects of his character were cruelly reflected in the events of the first weeks of the war. His inordinate faith in his own foresight, his understanding of political processes and, in particular, of military processes, and his refusal to change his assessments despite objective intelligence information led to heavy losses of manpower and equipment, space and time.

M.S. Gorbachev's report at the ceremonial session on 2-3 November 1987 contains balanced assessments of I.V. Stalin's activity at various periods of our state's life and, in particular, during the Great Patriotic War. We must use them as a basis if we are not to color the whole picture of the war and the personality of I.V. Stalin as Supreme Commander in a single hue and not to overemphasize the infallibility of some or the fatal senselessness of the actions of others.

During the Great Patriotic War the Soviet Armed Forces carried out dozens of strategic operations and hundreds of operations on fronts and involving armies, the bulk of which were aggressive. According to established thinking they all fit into nine military campaigns and the whole war falls into three periods. Not all historians adhere to that viewpoint and in the scientific milieu there are opinions about the need to change the existing periodization of the war. Without wishing to anticipate the results of the possible discussions and decisions on this topic during the preparation of the 10-volume work, let us note that any proposed change must be thoroughly validated.

The main character in the Great Patriotic War was the people. Soviet people's active participation in the struggle against the fascist aggressors under the slogan "All for the front, all for victory!" gave the Great Patriotic War the character of a war of all the people. Millions took part in the war. Virtually every heroic deed by an individual was multiplied and grew into the mass heroism of many, many thousands of people. It is very important to show that convincingly. The intention is to show the combat operations of the Armed Forces not just on the scale of whole fronts and armies but wherever possible at the level of formations and units; and to provide greater and more interesting coverage of the direct creators of the Victory.

It is well known that during the years of the most difficult trials, the Leninist party became a fighting party, which fused with the people at war. During the Soviet people's Great Patriotic War it proved equal to the responsibility which befell it. It performed its duty—it led the country to the Great Victory over fascism. Our ideological adversaries overlook that fact, too. In trying to appear objective they put forward their own interpretation of a phenomenon which, from their viewpoint, is inexplicable—the Soviet state's durability. They inevitably take the slippery slope of falsification when they seek the answer to what they call a "miracle" either in the "fatal" mistakes of Hitler or in the generous aid of the USSR's allies.

Our arguments are immeasurably more substantial. They contain the evidence of direct participants in the events and documents. Veterans write about little-known episodes from the war and describe fights and battles in which they participated. Museum workers write and offer materials and documents—the fruits of many years of research activity. Figuratively speaking, the people have been writing their own multivolume work for a long time now. Not a single useful and truthful line of the work that they have prepared should be left unanalyzed or not assessed on its merits.

It is well-known that the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism, the USSR Defense Ministry Institute of Military History, the USSR Academy of Sciences General History Institute, the History of the USSR Institute, and other institutes belonging to the

USSR Academy of Sciences are involved in writing the work. The Institute of Military History, furthermore, has been given the task of coordinating all the scientific research work.

The main editorial commission led by Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense, is nearing the completion of its complex and diverse scientific and organizational functions. The main editorial commission consists of military leaders, expert historians—academicians and directors of USSR Academy of Sciences scientific research institutes—and representatives of the All-Union Council of War and Labor Veterans and of the Soviet War Veterans Committee.

All our lives are affected by history; we all need history. It is important to ensure that those who study it see not only the logic and are aware of the continuity of military events but can also understand the philosophy of the last war. The most important lesson of those events, which happened so long ago but which are so alive in the memory, is that there must never be a third world war.

The new work is expected to help shape the new thinking which regards a world without military violence, weapons, or wars as the cherished ideal. "This," as M.S. Gorbachev said about the history of the motherland and the party at the 20th Komsomol Congress, "must be an honest, courageous, and captivating book, which shows the heroic path of the country and the party—the path of trailblazers—in all its grandeur. A book which does not avoid the drama of the events and of human destinies, a book with no blank pages, subjective preferences or antipathies, and a book whose value does not depend on passing fads."

Book on Lenin's Guidance of Cheka Reviewed
PM101721 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Dec 87 First Edition p 2

[M. Stepichev article under the "Among the Books" rubric: "The Shield and Sword of October"; boldface as published]

[Text] It is with a sense of understandable excitement that we pick up each new book that reflects Ilich's theoretical thought, deeds, and behest on the revolutionary validation and practical implementation of the bases of the new system. It is not for us just a collection of sentences but a powerful instrument for action. The second, enlarged edition of the collection of documents entitled "V.I. Lenin and the All-Russian Cheka" is one such book. (Footnote) ("V.I. Lenin i VCHK. Sbornik Dokumentov (1917-1922)." Moscow, Political Literature Publishing House, 1987, pp 642) Many of the documents are published for the first time.

The published material provides a vivid picture of V.I. Lenin's enormous work in creating the All-Russian Extraordinary Commission for Combating Counterrevolution and Sabotage, in the practical direction of its activity, and in the development and implementation of the fundamental principles of state security organs' work.

As early as the first Russian revolution, in 1906, V.I. Lenin pointed out that "There is no revolution and there cannot be a revolution without counterrevolution." And life has shown indeed that the exploiters will never voluntarily hand over power to the working people. When a new social system appeared on the map after the October Revolution the overthrown oppressors declared brutal war on it. The young republic found itself ringed by fire and in the grip of an economic blockade.

The advanced forces of the working class and all working people rose up to fight the counterrevolution. The Red Army was formed under the leadership of V.I. Lenin. But the furious onslaught of reaction and the overall situation urgently demanded extreme, resolute measures; it was necessary, as Lenin put it, "to stake our all." The logic of the class struggle dictated the need to create an organ of the dictatorship of the proletariat possessing the means and methods to promptly detect and thwart the designs of counterrevolution and quickly and decisively suppress plots, sabotage, subversion, and espionage.

Such an organ was set up on V.I. Lenin's initiative. On 7/20 December 1917 the Soviet of People's Commissars adopted a resolution on the organization of the All-Russian Cheka. Feliks Edmundovich Dzerzhinskiy was appointed its chairman. Along with him the party's Central Committee sent into the All-Russian Cheka seasoned Leninist Communists who had experience of underground revolutionary struggle against tsarism as well as the finest representatives of the working class.

The All-Russian Cheka... Its deeds form a vivid page in the annals of the revolution. The new, specialized organ of Soviet power posed a threat to its enemies and served as a reliable shield of the state's security and defender of working people's interests.

The documents in the book show how the Chekists exposed the criminal Kaledin conspiracy involving members of foreign military missions and embassies. The conspirators were preparing to send a train from Petrograd to Rostov loaded with weapons for the White Guards. But the "secret train" went nowhere. It was seized by a Cheka detachment.

The All-Russian Cheka was invested with extraordinary powers, but it used them to the full only in exceptional cases, when the state was faced with the most acute situation presenting mortal danger to it, and only against irreconcilable enemies of the revolution. During the fierce attacks on Soviet Russia carried out by internal and international reaction in the fall of 1918, when it was

essential to know every step the counterrevolutionaries took and to punish them "according to their deserts," and to do so without delay, V.I. Lenin told a Chekist rally on 7 November 1918: "It is important for us that the Cheka directly exercise the dictatorship of the proletariat, and in this regard their role is invaluable."

During the Civil War and foreign intervention Chekists exposed and neutralized hundreds of counterrevolutionary organizations and liquidated many espionage, subversion, and sabotage groups. Together with army units they put down kulak uprisings, destroyed bandit detachments and gangs, combated speculation and bribery, and helped to solve food questions and eliminate the problem of homeless children. Attacks against the Soviet state by monarchists, the Cadets, the Socialist Revolutionaries, anarchists, and members of other hostile organizations were paralyzed with Cheka help. Railroad, frontline, and border Cheka organs were active.

Cheka activity was always at the focus of attention of the party Central Committee, the Soviet Government, and V.I. Lenin personally, who often met with Chekist collectives. Ilich—and this is extensively reflected in the book—instructed the Chekists in the characteristics of the struggle against the class enemies. The drafts of most of the key directives and resolutions on the All-Russian Cheka were written by him.

The collected material convincingly shows that party leadership, the close link with the masses, and strict adherence to socialist legality were always the basis of the activity of the All-Russian Cheka. Questions concerning Chekist organs were frequently heard at plenums and sessions of the party Central Committee Politburo. V.I. Lenin and the party kept constant watch to ensure that the All-Russian Cheka constantly checked its activity against the policy line of the party Central Committee and strenghthened its link with the people.

In his closing words to the Seventh All-Russian Congress of Soviets in 1919 published here V.I. Lenin noted that counterrevolutionary plots were not exposed "by accident." "They were detected because the plotters had to live among the masses and could not do without workers or peasants in their plots, and here they... always come up against people who go to the... Cheka and say 'Exploiters have assembled over there.'"

Vladimir Ilich naturally also had in mind a major Chekist operation to eliminate a rising in Moscow prepared by the White Guard counterrevolutionary organization called the National Center. Working in the closest contact with the party Central Committee, the All-Russian Cheka kept the Central Committee and V.I. Lenin clearly informed about the prevailing situation and alarm signals received from working people. The plotters' aim was to seize Moscow and eliminate Soviet power. The organization was subsidized by Kolchak and the Entente. The Chekists seized an officer, a Kolchak courier, carrying a million rubles on him for the plotters; they had previously been sent 25 million. On one of the reports V.I. Lenin wrote to Dzerzhinskiy: "**Special** attention must be paid to the attached, that is to sy, to the operation. The seizure must be swift, energetic, and **as extensive as possible**." The question was examined by the party Central Committee on the eve of the operation. Shortly afterward, as the proceedings of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Central Committee make clear, Dzerzhinskiy reported to the party center that the White Guard nest was liquidated in 2 days.

It is clear from the collected documents that concern for high responsibility and party-mindedness in the All-Russian Cheka's work and for the selection and political training of its cadres received V.I. Lenin's special attention. Ilich's advice to Cheka staffers that they enhance their professional skill, master the art of combat, and be decisive in fighting on the invisible front is reflected in the book.

Lenin reacted sharply to mistaken views and ill-considered actions on the part of some Chekists and misuse of the rights given them, and he unswervingly demanded that the sharp weapon of the All-Russian Cheka organs should efficiently strike down the enemies of the revolution and that socialist legality be strictly observed. The book cites a large number of Lenin's notes and telegrams containing inquiries concerning the arrest of particular people, the basis for the charges brought against them, and demands for careful checking of the investigation of specific cases.

When the foreign interventionists were crushed and the civil war was over the country set about peaceful building, and the need for extraordinary measures and powers in combating class enemies abated. Based on the party course, V.I. Lenin redefined the tasks of the All-Russian Cheka organs and put forward the idea of reexamining its functions and competence, limiting them to political tasks. At the same time, the party leader, based on experience of the struggle against the subversive activity of internal counterrevolution and the intelligence services of capitalist countries, concluded that there was a long-term need in the system of a socialist state for the existence of an organ protecting state security. Without such an institution, V.I. Lenin pointed out in his report to the Ninth All-Russian Congress of Soviets, the power of the working people cannot exist while exploiters exist in the world.

The basic principles of the activity of Soviet state security organs, formed on the foundation of V.I. Lenin's ideas and instructions, and the glorious Chekist traditions have not lost any significance today. It is well known that serious violations of Leninist principles concerning the activity of state security organs were committed during the years of the cult of personality and that attempts were made to remove them from party control. This was at variance with the very essence of our system and led to unjustified repression. Many Chekists

during those difficult years acted against breaches of legality. Quite a few of those who had worked with F.E. Dzerzhinskiy became innocent victims.

The CPSU has roundly condemned deviations from the Leninist norms of party and state life. Reliable political and legal guarantees have been created to ensure the observance of socialist legality in the activity of Chekist organs. The activity of KGB organs is pursued in conformity with the USSR Constitution and the principles of socialist democracy and is based on strong ties with working people. Together with the party and the people Chekists are restructuring their activity and improving the forms and methods of their work, thereby improving its effectiveness.

Working under the leadership of the CPSU and its Central Committee, they are now facilitating through their activity the successful development of revolutionary restructuring in our country, carrying out much work in exposing hostile intrigues, stopping all sorts of subversive actions by imperialist special services, and doing their utmost to reliably ensure the motherland's security.

Economic

First Business With Shareholders Reported

WA161709 Paris AFP in English 1142 GMT 16 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, Dec 16 (AFP) - A Ukrainian agricultural firm is setting up the Soviet Union's first business with the participation of shareholders, taking advantage of greater autonomy allowed individual firms under reforms which are decentralising the state-run economy, a Soviet weekly reported Wednesday.

The weekly MOSCOW NEWS said that the Lvov agricultural collective of Provesin—Ukrainian for "the eve of spring"—would issue shares to the Soviet public from next January in order to finance its plans to cultivate vegetables in greenhouses on a 40-hectare plot to overcome chronic shortages faced by the town of 800,000 people.

MOSCOW NEWS appeared to actively promote the idea, running the article under a headline reading: "Buy Shares of the Agricultural Firm Provesin". The paper also gave the address and bank account number of the Ukrainian firm.

Provesin General Director Ivan Pivnya promised that shareholders' dividends would be "twice as high" as interest provided by state banks, currently running at two to three per cent. Provesin management would have a controlling interest in the company, holding 60 per cent of the shares.

The initiative comes amid a debate among Soviet economists on whether the Soviet Union should set up a stock exchange, as economic reforms are introduced injecting market forces into the centrally-planned economy.

Economist Nikolay Shmelev, in the latest issue of the weekly NEW TIMES, called for Soviet businesses to issue shares and bonds to the public, in order to use the 200 billion rubles (300 billion dollars) lying idle in private bank accounts.

But a leading economic adviser to Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, Abel Aganbegyan, in October ruled out the creation of a Soviet stock exchange in the near future.

Mr. Pivnya said that 22 local firms, including the railways and an agricultural machine-building plant, had already offered funds for the project.

He said that shareholders would be able to withdraw their money, plus dividend, at will, "as long as the company has started to make a profit". He added that interest would be paid either in cash or with vegetables.

The state had an interest in the initiative succeeding, because the production of vegetables for the population was beneficial to society as a whole, he said.

Mr. Pivnya, apparently alluding to the new legislation promulgating new economic mechanisms which does not expressly forbid the creation of firms with private capital, said his company was working on the principle: "if it's not illegal, it's permissible."

He told MOSCOW NEWS his company did not fear bankruptcy, and on the contrary had plans to expand through contacts with eastern bloc economic partners within the Comecon trading bloc.

Attitudes Hampering Economic Reform Scored

PM151521 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 11 December 1987 in its Second Edition carries on page 1 under the rubric "Radical Reform" and the headline "How Are We Entering the New Year?" a 400-word report by own correspondent N. Senchev describing the largely positive experience of self-financing at the Saransk "Svetotekhnika" Production Association and a 400-word account of problems at the Karaganda Metallurgical Combine tin-plate shop, blamed mainly on equipment supplied by "Uralmash," unrealistic plans drawn up by the ministry, and their own shortcomings. The reports are followed by editorial comment which reads:

"Our Commentary:

"In a matter of days many thousands of labor collectives in dozens of sectors of industry, construction, transport, trade, and science will switch to conditions of full

economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing. The USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association) is coming into force. A new major stage of the radical economic reform in the national economy is opening.

"Now the reform program will involve the whole of our society and affect the interests of tens of millions of people. This new and very complex stage of restructuring demands from every economic and party leader and all the working people a new approach to work. We will not get far with the old methods, pressure, and hectoring; they will not work in the new conditions. It is important now to rely on the best, most aware, and well-prepared forces in the labor collectives themselves, to instill new economic thinking in people, to master genuine, sound economic attitudes.

"The process of restructuring in the economy is getting under way in difficult conditions. There is a substantial number of loss-making enterprises. And there are even more of those whose financial position is unstable and who, by force of habit, expect financial 'injections' from the ministerial purse. There are still many cases of plain and simple mismanagement, inefficiency, and bureaucratic lethargy on the part of managers, and low discipline and substandard workmanship on the shop floor. Furthermore restructuring is sometimes hampered by the personnel's poor knowledge of the new conditions of management.

"The reform will not reach the hands, minds, and hearts of the working people easily and of its own accord. Leaders, party officials, Communists, pacesetters, and innovators must keep explaining to people the price that will have to be paid for a frivolous, complacent attitude toward the transition to full economic accountability as merely another campaign which will peter out as so many before have done. Moods of panic spread by loudmouths and slackers must also be rebuffed. It is not scandalmongering or attitudes of dependence which are needed now but calm and honest labor.

"Labor collectives, which succeed in introducing economic accountability in practice rather than in theory in every workshop, section, and team, and in conveying its meaning to every worker, will reap success. People's energy must be chanelled toward the main aim—the identification of reserves. There are many of them at every enterprise; they lie in the reduction of production costs, efforts to ensure smooth operation, a radical improvement of the quality and technical standard of output, stronger labor discipline, and the reduction of above-norm stocks. All these problems can and must be resolved only with the direct and committed participation of the labor collectives themselves.

"The attempts of certain economic organ officials to sidestep the USSR Law on the Enterprise will be doomed to failure only if the broadest masses of the working people are well informed about and capable of applying the provisions of the new law. To ensure this, serious and constant economic education is needed. Thanks to this education every management worker must rid himself of the tendency to depend on others, he must have a clear idea of the development conditions and prospects of his enterprise and its social sphere, and be familiar with the ways of increasing his labor productivity and remuneration.

"Many of the keys to full economic accountability and the mobilization of enterprises' initiative still lie in the hands of central economic organs and sector ministries. People there are in no hurry to join in the restructuring. No substantial changes have so far taken place in planning, material and technical supply, pricing, and financial and credit relations. Owing to this, many enterprises are beginning their work in the new conditions burdened by the imbalance between plans on the one hand and capacities and resources on the other hand, and they are frequently unable to make good use of earned means. The materials published above also reflect this. It is unquestionable that full economic accountability in the basic component of the economy makes it necessary to accelerate the restructuring of the work of sector headquarters and central planning organs."

Stalin's Economic System Must Be Replaced

PM152001 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Dec 87 p 11

[Article by Candidate of Philosophical Sciences A.B. Kobyakov, leader of a group on self-management problems at the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems Labor Scientific Research Institute: "Investing People With Rights in a Bolder Way": first paragraph is unattributed introduction]

[Excerpts] In which direction should social self-management develop? The authors of our articles have devoted themselves to this question on more than one occasion (the latest article in this series was "How They Study Profit in Vygoda," by V. Yanelis, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 22 July 1987). The period since the adoption of the Law on the Labor Collective (1983) and the present period when the Law on the State Enterprise has started to be effective are typified by the intensive development of democratic norms. It is no accident that interest in the topic is increasing so much today. This is evidenced again by the viewpoint of A.B. Kobyakov, leader of a group on problems of self-management at the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems Labor Scientific Research Institute, who evaluates the experience of recent years.

Discussions about democracy are now being held everywhere—on all the floors of our social edifice. We have started to get a taste for it. But sometimes there is a certain skepticism mixed in. This is what a worker at a Moscow enterprise said to me:

"All this happened before, in the sixties. The shop chief and the collective's council were elected. This is happening again now. But as the bosses used to decide, without asking anybody, so it will be in the future too."

Or here is a letter in the newspaper. It voices the same doubts: "Over this period I have seen on more than one occasion how many campaigns, intended supposedly to boost the working people's activeness to the skies, have flared up, made a lot of noise, and ultimately fizzled out. Won't things turn out the same this time too?"

So what does the present Law on the State Enterprise or Association provide, to ensure that self-management is genuine and not merely a formality? Primarily: The labor collective is placed on the realistic footing of the new economic mechanism whose basis is economic accountability [khozraschet]. And genuine economic accountability [khozraschet] is when the enterprise, the shop, and the team decide for themselves how to organize their work, how to distribute the money earned, how to make up the collective, and who to hire and fire.

We already have examples of such economic accountability [khozraschet] in our country. Moreover, considerable experience has been accumulated in the fraternal socialist countries too. And the new economic relations have been consolidated by law there. For example, the new labor code in Bulgaria stipulates that a person is to be hired for work only with the consent of a general meeting of the primary collective, and it has to solve other problems too within the framework of the independence granted to it.

So then, one of the main principles is independence. The labor collective is the fully accredited boss of the enterprise. So the law states. It is a vital factor, and without it self-management is no more than a fiction.

We are only just beginning. For this reason it is very important not to make mistakes at the start of this journey, and not to reject what has already been done. Foreign experience, for example, which testifies to to the enterprise mamagement the need to reserve the main economic leadership functions and the direct management of the production process, that is, the areas where unified leadership is expedient. But social questions, including wages, the distribution of material benefits, and cadre policy belong to the sphere of competence of the boss, that is, the collective; and it fixes the general trends of production development.

The first practical steps in our own self-management confirm the correctness of the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum's conclusions that the organs of self-management, meaning the labor collectives' councils, must be invested with key powers on a broad range of production, social, and cadre questions.

At a recent seminar I noted down an extract from a speech by the deputy general director for cadre questions of a major production association: "I realize that I am cutting the ground from under my own feet, but I am forced to say that if the labor collective's organs are not granted the right to solve questions of hiring and firing, promotion and demotion, and so forth, then self-management will be only formal."

I agree with him completely.

The selection and placement of cadres by the will of the management saps the essence of self-management and ultimately impairs the new economic mechanism. It preserves broad scope for arbitrary behavior by management. I believe that the solution of cadre questions and material incentives should be left to the economic leader only at apparatus level.

The whole problem of relations between the leader and the labor collective is one of the most complex problems in the period of the development of self-management. The law has declared the labor collective to be the fully accredited boss of the enterprise. But, in order for it to really become the boss, it is necessary to restructure social relations, create a mechanism for coordinating working people's interests, force out kowtowing to higher authorities, abandon the philosophy that "there are bodies there to decide things," and return to full-blooded proletarian democracy.

Through the present time we have been living according to schemas established contrary to the Leninist concept of social development. At the 14th party congress, I.V. Stalin expounded the bases of the economic system which, with various modifications, has existed through all the past decades. In his thinking the interests of people, groups, and classes as the basis for the development of economic relations in society were tacitly rejected, and the development of contradictions was replaced by the search for correct solutions. He stressed that we need reserves which can cover our mistakes. That is, it was stipulated that a leader has the right to make a mistake, and working people have the right to rectify that mistake by their labor.

The difference between Lenin and Stalin in the understanding of social processes is important, and has a direct bearing on current problems. For Lenin the experience of the masses and their self-advancement were of tremendous importance. For Stalin the tasks that arose from the confrontation with the capitalist world were fundamental. As for the masses, they had to be educated and drawn into an understanding of these tasks. Lenin moved from people to the tasks of socialist building, while Stalin started with the tasks. People were reserved the right merely to fulfill these tasks. It is possible to understand Stalin. The most important thing for him was the struggle against capitalism to uphold the new society, and in my opinion he preferred not to notice socialism's own contradictions. So it happened that the

task of coordinating the interests of working people with the interests of society was implemented in certain periods automatically and directly, and there was no need for any special mechanism. This applies to the periods of industrialization and the Great Patriotic War, when the interests of the individual and the state merged together. However, as economic and social development progressed in peacetime conditions, the need for such a mechanism grew. So self-management is in fact a form of such a coordination of interests, and its creation is the fulfillment of Lenin's designs for developing social relations under socialism on the basis of the consideration of working people's interests.

But it must be confessed that the old system of relations is amazingly tenacious. It takes on new forms, while stubbornly preserving its former essence. This applies to self-management too. You want a labor collective council? Certainly. But headed by the leader. The labor collective is the boss? Say what you please, but the leader of the collective is the real chief. [passage omitted]

The fate of self-management frequently depends on the relations between the technocrat and the bureaucrat. At the first stage they are enemies. The bureaucrat favors privileges according to position and excessive bureaucracy and is against economic accountability [khozraschet] and economic independence. The technocrat favors privileges according to knowledge, economic accountability [khozraschet], economic independence, and economic management methods. But as soon as the technocrat wins a victory and occupies the bureaucrat's chair, he begins to understand that he cannot get by without the bureaucrat. Yet they have something in common—they are both in favor of privileges. The technocrat does not know how to handle the collective, especially in conditions of self-management, while the bureaucrat is a genius at nonformal links. It is difficult to get by without him. A union between the technocrat and bureaucrat emerges. Unfortunately, this is confirmed by practice, and not only our own practice. [passage omitted]

An economist from a sector scientific research institute turned to our group for consultation on self-management questions. We explained everything to her and provided her with literature. But she continued to be perplexed: "I always thought that laboratory assistants and ordinary scientific workers had to be educated and demands made on them. But you say we must proceed from their interests and consider their interests. It is very difficult to get accustomed to such an approach. Everything must be changed from top to bottom."

Yes, things must be changed. The situation in which subordinates are morally and materially dependent on leaders must be reviewed. We must be bolder about investing labor collectives' councils with rights, and we must not be afraid of their initial lack of competence. People rapidly learn to understand issues, especially questions on which their well-being depends. We talk a lot about the creativity of the masses; well, let them really create and build up both themselves and the economy.

Relations in the collective must be boosted to become truly socialist relations. Only then is an economic spurt possible. Not much will be achieved by the old methods of coercion and slogans. It is time to set in motion the real levers—the democratization of production management and firm economic laws.

Briefs

Shipping Facility in Vladivostok

A new quay has begun receiving ships in Vladivostok fishing port. Its unusual design and powerful hoisting mechanisms make it possible for cargoes weighing up to 40 tonnes to be handled, and the great depth of the bay provides an opportunity for the largest factory ships and depot ships to tie up there. The entry into service of the quay is one of the stages in the reconstruction of this very large harbor in the Far East. [Text] [*Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2230 GMT 16 Dec 87 LD*]

Agricultural

Ligachev Addresses Conference on 1988 Harvest
PM171039 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Dec 87 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Reliable Material and Technical Support for the 1988 Harvest"]

[Text] This November the CPSU Central Committee addressed a letter to machine operators, leaders of economically accountable [khozraschetnyy] contract collectives, specialists, scientists, kolkhoz chairmen, sovkhoz directors, workers in industry supplying the countryside with material and technical means, and all labor collectives in the agro-industrial complex to ensure timely and qualitative preparations for spring field work and harvest work and to obtain a high harvest in 1988.

The success of spring sowing and of harvesting will largely depend on the timely and reliable preparation of equipment. It is a question of ensuring that sowing and tilling machines are fully ready to work no later than 1 February, and all harvesting and feed procurement equipment by 1 April.

The steady supply of the necessary spare parts and repair materials to kolkhozes and sovkhozes and the rational organization of the labor of machine operators engaged in preparing equipment are a very important condition for resolving this task. This and other components of the future harvest were discussed at a conference of leaders of USSR ministries and departments held at the CPSU Central Committee 15 December.

Reports on the fulfillment of plans to supply the countryside with equipment, spare parts, and other resources were delivered at the conference by E.A. Kalinin, USSR first deputy minister of agricultural and tractor machine building; N.A. Pugin, USSR minister of the automotive industry; Ye.A. Varnachev, USSR minister of construction, road, and municipal machine building; A.N. Makukhin, USSR first deputy minister of power and electrification; V.A. Bykov, USSR minister of the medical and microbiological industry; and N.M. Olshanskiy, USSR minister for mineral fertilizer production.

Summing up the conference, Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, pointed to positive trends in the development of the country's agriculture over recent years and emphasized the importance of consolidating them and increasing food volumes in every possible way. The attention of leaders of ministries and departments supplying the countryside with material and technical resources was drawn to the need for a responsible, priority approach to providing agriculture with material and technical resources.

The following have ended up greatly in debt to kolkhoz and sovkhoz machine operators in terms of supplying spare parts: the Noginsk Fuel Apparatus Plant, the "Tulskiy Kombaynovyy Zavod" and "Krasnoyarskoye" Production Associations for grain-harvesting combines, the "Kharkovskiy Motorostroitelnyy Zavod" and "Serp i Molot" Production Associations, the Altay Motor Plant, the Vladimir Tractor Plant of the USSR Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building, the "Avtodizel" Production Association, the Lebedin Piston Ring Plant, the Rostov Bearing Plant, and other enterprises of the USSR Ministry of the Automotive Industry, the Kentau and Kovrov Excavator Plants, the Andizhan Machine-building Plant, and the Kamyshin Crane Truck Plant of the USSR Ministry of Construction, Road, and Municipal Machine Building.

A strained situation is taking shape with regard to supplying kolkhozes and sovkhozes with spare parts next year as well. Many enterprises of machine-building ministries have not yet finished concluding contracts for their supply. The USSR Gosplan, the USSR Gossnab, the USSR State Prices Committee, the USSR Gosagroprom, and other departments and machine-building ministries are entrusted with drawing up proposals to encourage the production and delivery of scarce spare parts, including contract prices and other economic levers.

The speech emphasized that work has still not been properly developed to prepare for spring sowing and for harvest work either at the center or in a number of oblasts, krays, and republics. The pace of repairs to agricultural equipment remains low on many farms in the Ukrainian, Uzbek, Kazakh, Kirghiz, Turkmen, Tajik, Moldavian, and Lithuanian SSR's, Belgorod, Saratov, Orenburg, and Chita Oblasts, and Altay and Krasnoyarsk Krays. Here special attention was drawn to the quality of repair work.

Ye.K. Ligachev dwelt on questions of organizing vocational and economic studies for machine operators, training them in intensive techniques, and getting them to master economic methods of management.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary drew the attention of leaders of the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification to the need to resolutely improve the power supply to the agro-industrial complex. The corresponding departments are entrusted with drawing up proposals to enhance the economic responsibility of USSR Power and Electrification Ministry enterprises for groundless cutting of the electricity supply to kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

Questions of the preparations for the organized performance of spring sowing and the gathering of next year's harvest must be the focus of people's control organs and the mass news and propaganda media. The public must be more widely involved in resolving them.

Participating in the work of the conference were V.S. Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gosagroprom; S.I. Manyakin, chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee; and senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee apparatus.

Scientific

'Raduga' Satellite Orbital Parameters Noted

PM161543 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 December 1987 in its Second Edition carries on page 2 under the headline "'Raduga' in Flight" a TASS report on the 10 December launch of the "Raduga" communications satellite which provides the following initial orbital parameters:

Distance from earth's surface—35,000 km;

Period of earth orbit—23 hours 16 minutes;

Inclination of orbit—1.3 degrees.

'Unstable' Satellite Operation Reported

LD161735 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT
16 Dec 87

[Text] Esteemed Comrades, according to a report from the USSR Ministry of Communications, transmission of Central Television programs in a number of regions in the European part of the country is temporarily being hampered because of unstable operation of the satellite channel. In connection with this, the program Orbita-4

Vostok will temporarily be broadcast on the Moskva receiving station in a number of population centers of the Republics of the Transcaucasus, the Baltic, Moldavia, the Ukraine, and Oblasts of the RSFSR. Measures for the earliest possible resumption of normal transmission of Central Television programs are being taken by the USSR Ministry of Communications.

Academician Koptyug Clarifies PRAVDA Article

PM171321 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Dec 87 Second Edition p 6

[Letter by Academician V. Koptyug, chairman of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department, under the "Letter to the Editorial Office" rubric: "Necessary Clarification"]

[Text] PRAVDA published on 7 December an article by N.Ilinskaya entitled "Concerning a Vacancy," which says, among other things, that "Siberia and the Far East have become a kind of powerhouse of scientific knowledge." The USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department does not exclude the possibility of inviting specialists from the European part of the country if the need arises but issues such invitations comparatively rarely. Let me illustrate this by means of the 1981 and 1984 elections and the nomination of candidates for the 1987 elections.

Fifteen people were elected corresponding members of the Siberian Department in 1981, and of those two were invited to work in Siberia from other cities: Yu.S. Urzhumets, corresponding member of the Latvian SSR Academy of Sciences (invited to work in Yakutsk in 1979) and Doctor of Chemical Sciences G.F. Bolshakov (invited to work in Tomsk in 1980).

Twelve corresponding members were elected to the Siberian Department in 1984. All of them had worked in Siberia at least 18 years, and not 2-4 years, as N. Ilinskaya wrote.

For the 1987 elections of corresponding members, a general meeting of the Siberian Department recommended 40 specialists working in the department's institutes and other establishments in Siberia from among a large number of nominees. Not a single specialist currently working in Moscow or other cities in the European part of the country figured among those recommended. Of the 40 recommended, only 1 was of recent arrival in Siberia.

Members of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department are transferred to Moscow on the recommendation of official bodies and by decision of the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium as a rule, with the aim of using many years of scientific and organizational experience acquired in Siberia in crucial work there. It is not surprising, therefore, that such transfers mainly affect academicians rather than corresponding members of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Thus Academicians G.I. Marchuk, A.L. Yanshin, A.G. Aganbegyan, and Ye.I. Shemyakin, each of whom had worked in the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department 14-18 years, were transferred to Moscow in 1980-1987 and Academician G.A. Mesyats, who had worked in the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department since 1969, was elected chairman of the USSR Academy of Sciences Ural Department in 1986.

Military

Intellectuals Rapped Over 'Hostility' Toward Army

PM151337 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

["Polemical Notes" by special correspondent A. Khorev: "Echo of Malicious Talk"; boldface as published]

[Excerpts] In Pyatigorsk, right at the foot of Mashuk, is a mountain on which the life of a great Russian poet ebbed away and which therefore is conducive to a mood of philosophical melancholy. There a beautifully designed and tended military memorial, a Valley of Remembrance, created by nature itself, with a view over the mountains, stretches out. Here, beneath polished slabs of gray marble, lie the remains of servicemen who died in the fighting to defend the Caucasus. Each slab bears the names of the fallen. All around there are flowers and the kind of silence found only in cemeteries. The memorial is a little way from the road, so there are not usually many people around. But it is not deserted; you always encounter a few vacationers.

I, too, went there several times when I was on vacation at the Pyatigorsk military sanatorium. Such sacred places have their attractions. You wander about, stand a while, think melancholy thoughts—and you feel cleansed and clearheaded, as it were. It is not for nothing that the popular saw says: When you feel very cheerful, visit a cemetery, and when you feel very sad, do the same.... It both raises the spirits and restores composure.

But one day, my serene mood was spoiled right at the entrance to the memorial. Two middle-aged women were walking toward me and exchanging impressions, and I could not help overhearing their conversation.

"What a fine cemetery," one was saying as they drew level with me.

"Yes," the other replied, "the military always grab the best of everything for themselves." [passage omitted]

The woman's blasphemous rejoinder about the fallen front-line soldiers could probably have been taken as a casual remark, as a primitive philistine sigh, had I not occasionally found the hostility toward the "military" contained in it expressed in the sentiments and remarks of some of our citizens, particularly journalists and writers. Lately such remarks increasingly often find their way into the press and onto television. They are usually

in the nature of passing rejoinders and contain no detailed justification. The author slaps a thick brushstroke on the canvas with the hand of a master and carries on, without going into details. He expresses not the slightest concern whether this creates the impression of a tendentious, unexplained onslaught against completely innocent people.

"The Army," one young writer says, for instance, "long remained unexplored territory for our literature, despite the fact that there are mountains of books from the Military Literature Publishing House portraying army life today the way a staff general dozing in a hammock at his dacha sees it." The target of the author's sarcasm, as we can see, is not so much the books produced by the Military Literature Publishing House as a "generalized" general.

"...Whose money, esteemed retired colonel from Leningrad, paid for your colonel's wages, your chrome leather boots, and your cheviot greatcoat at a time when people in Russian villages ceased getting anything at all for their labor-days," another author reproaches a veteran who appealed to the editorial office.

"A teacher is not a colonel. He does not retire," yet another writer remarks meaningfully, apparently not realizing that retirement and a pension are fundamentally the same and that retired officers scarcely work less than pensioned-off teachers.

Don't those passages contain something similar in meaning and spirit to the woman's rejoinder at the Pyatigorsk military cemetery? The only thing that is not quite clear is which comes first and which second: the envy of the woman in the cemetery or the malicious talk of certain writers, which is no better.

Taken individually, each of these remarks may seem to be a passing hotheaded remark, blunder, or slip of the tongue that does not merit attention. But, following one another and forming a series, they become a factor influencing public awareness and creating around the Army an unhealthy atmosphere of hostility that has been alien to it from its very inception.

Not so long ago (29 August) KRASNAYA ZVEZDA published an article of mine entitled "Is the Artillery Firing on Its Own Men...?" It said that the number of pieces in newspapers and magazines touching on questions of army life and military-patriotic education had increased lately and that these pieces contain more and more superficial, incorrect judgments. In particular, the article quoted examples such as the bald claim by a group of academics that "creative abilities atrophy and die" during military service, and so it is stupid to draft students into the Army; the self-confident, unconvincing generalizations of one writer about so-called nonregulation relations in the Army; and a proposal to replace military-patriotic education with "antimilitary-patriotic education...."

Readers have given a lively response to the article and have with one accord supported its basic propositions. Several letters express the idea that nonregulation relations in units have become quite widespread, and it is better to exaggerate the scale and danger of this "infection" in the interests of combating it than to minimize it. The letters recount a number of glaring instances of barracks hooliganism. But the astonishing feature that unites all these alarming letters is this: The facts contained in them belong to the sphere of recollections. Furthermore, almost all are not the recollections of the writers themselves but have been recorded by them from someone else's account.

Tarasov, a student, sent a eight-page-long, angry message quoting at length from a letter from a former classmate, who is now a sailor and describes how senior servicemen on the ship bully the youngsters. Tarasov makes sweeping generalizations on the basis of this and expresses his anger. Maybe it is justified anger, but he diligently avoids saying anything that can be checked: He indicates neither his own address, nor the name and address of the comrade who wrote him, nor the name of the ship nor even of the fleet where that comrade is serving.

No letter pointing to cases of nonregulation relations was received from young servicemen currently on active duty.

This could be explained by saying that they are afraid of the vengeance of senior servicemen. But, one wonders, what does the student Tarasov have to fear, when he has specific information about malicious hooliganism? Does he choose to fulminate into the void...? Surely the reason why particular evils often prove tenacious in our lives is that we know how to blather about combating them, but, so to speak, often do not have the stomach to shoulder the common burden.

Various large-scale and comprehensive measures are now being taken to eradicate nonregulation relations in the Army. Certain writers wrongly think that they are the only people concerned about this problem. Both the force of the law and the educational process are being used to solve it.

Considerable opportunities for this also exist outside the Army; they lie in improving the military-patriotic education of young draftees. The determination to rebuff barracks hooligans can and must be instilled in every draftee even before they begin their service.

"The preconditions for eradicating nonregulation relations in the Army are created even before young men are drafted, in their civilian lives," Lieutenant Colonel (Reserve) V. Petrov wrote to the editorial board on behalf of a group of military instructors at secondary educational establishments in the Far East that held musters at a military school. "Many of us, especially those who work at vocational and technical schools, encounter these phenomena there, and people take them from there into the Army.... We must prepare young people for military service in such a way that the Army can deal in full

measure with its direct concern—strengthening combat readiness—rather than performing corrective functions and making up for omissions of families and schools. We very much hope for assistance from writers, poets, and people in the arts in this work. But what is this assistance like, if draftees see the Army as some kind of bogeyman, where creative abilities atrophy in 2 years and, who knows, there may be no end of beatings...?"

The idea of the "death of creative abilities" is condemned and rejected by many readers. "For instance, I served my 3 years in the Army, extended my service for another 2 years, then passed my examinations for a military school as an external student, and then graduated as an external student from an academy," Lieutenant Colonel A. Letunovskiy recounts. "I regard any talk of the 'stupefying' influence of military service as total nonsense. Of course, you can lag behind life, behind the age, behind the spirit of the time anywhere. As is well known, you must not let the grass grow beneath your feet. But in the Army, there is less room than anywhere for such 'feet,' since any hankering for knowledge is given every encouragement."

The father of a soldier, Candidate of Medical Sciences G. (he asks that his name not be given in the newspaper, since his son may not like everything in his letter), expresses some interesting views about the educational role of the Army:

"I am nearly 50 years old. My job is purely civilian. I have had nothing directly to do with army life for the last 20 years. Though I intellectually realized the importance of service, reminiscences of its actual ups and downs annoyed me. But I am sorry to say that I quite happily listened to the usual anecdotes about what the Army is like.

"But then the time came for my son to do his service. A good-natured lad, his parents' pride and joy, a typical modern critically minded student, he went to serve in the Volga region.

"His first letters waxed ironical about army life, army ways, army talk, and so forth, sometimes descending into sarcasm. Then all this began to disappear from his letters. It turned out that everything around him was not all that funny after all. He had been muddleheaded and had been looking the wrong way.

"Then came some revelations that were very pleasant surprises for his parents: It turns out that going for runs in waterproof boots is both useful and actually pleasant; sleeping in a tent in winter is even better; and in addition to all this, there is still time to marvel at sunrises and sunsets and discuss lofty matters.

"His recent letters were also pleasing: It turns out that the political workers in the unit are by no means the butt of jokes but educated people promoting the intellectual development even of contemporary wunderkinder....

"I believed all this yet did not believe it. But then an opportunity arose to visit my son. I was thorough in carrying out my 'on-site inspection.' On my return, I reported to my wife with a clear conscience: The kid is by no means making fools of his naive parents. He really has become wiser and has revised his views of service and probably of life as a whole under the influence of everything around him...."

Commenting on the article "Is the Artillery Firing on Its Own Men," Candidate of Philosophical Sciences Vladimir Yakovlevich Begun, senior scientific staffer of the Belorussian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy and Law, deems it very topical since "there are indeed people in our country who propound moral disarmament, nonresistance, and outright pacificism in printed and verbal statements." Not long before this, I read an article entitled "From Positions of Abstract Humanism," written by Comrade Begun and Doctor of Philosophical Sciences V. Bovsh and published in Minsk's POLITICHESKIY SOBESEDNIK (issue No 2, 1987).

...At a teachers' conference, the Belorussian writer A. Adamovich was asked how to educate future servicemen. He replied: "Teach them hatred of war and of killers, and you will get true patriots and defenders of life."

In order to prevent war, Adamovich believes it sufficient to introduce a new ethic prohibiting killing. This ethic will, he argues, lead to the prohibition of all wars....

Moral norms, V. Bovsh and V. Begun reasonably object, cannot be introduced as easily as traffic regulations, for instance. Morality is inculcated via the long accumulation of people's experience and is only then enshrined in customs, religious views, and legal norms. Far back in ancient times, it was said "Thou shalt not kill," yet the whole of human history is full of killing. People's behavior is determined not merely by their subjective will or by sermons, but by their socioeconomic position, class interests, and a multitude of other factors.

Today, the authors of the article say, it is a matter not of decreeing a new morality—peace-loving morality already exists. It is a matter of elaborating above all a new political thinking and new relations between states, a goal to which our party's and government's tireless efforts are devoted. The guarantee is not verbal incantations, not moralizing and nonresistance, but a policy of peace and great patriotism on the part of every Soviet citizen.

In my view, the Belorussian philosophers adopted a very good, assertive tone in the argument with their fellow Belorussian writer. The only mistake is that they did not mention the combat capability of our Armed Forces among the guarantees of peace.

It is perfectly possible that neither the woman in the Pyatigorsk cemetery who showed such misplaced envy of the military, nor the writers and academics who directly or indirectly display a prejudiced attitude toward the Army have any knowledge of theories of "antimilitary-patriotic education," or, if they do, do not necessarily go along with those theories.

But there is a connection between these scattered cases. They have, if you like, a common objective basis.

Over 4 decades of peace have made their mark on the consciousness of the entire generation that has grown up since the war. So far as some of our citizens are concerned, the war has begun to seem a mirage, the army virtually a plaything, and military service almost a game of soldiers.... Is this not one of the reasons for the decline in discipline in certain units., Is this not the explanation for the increasingly frequent cases of a frivolous and irresponsible attitude on the part of young citizens toward performing their military duty?

"In recent years," Colonel B. Yesipov, military commissar for the city of Ramenye in Moscow Oblast, recounts, "there has been an increase in the number of young people trying to dodge army service. These are mostly VUZ graduates and young men from so-called prosperous families. All kinds of means are used, up to and including the feigning of mental illness. They 'have pains everywhere,' especially in the head. They cannot endure physical stress. They 'cannot' serve any place that has either a hot or cold climate. If they are drafted anyway, they try to ensure that they are assigned only to places within sight of the beloved capital. You cannot expect such people to show diligence in service, to staunchly endure its hardships, or to say a good word for the Army, because the Army naturally gives no encouragement to their slovenliness."

The uncomplimentary comments about the Army also stem partly from the negative phenomena that infected it, like our whole society, during the stagnation period. Restructuring has highlighted them, and the public is entitled to react to them. But how to react—that is the question. You can react in a comradely way and try to help. Or you can react in a philistine way and miss no opportunity to bad-mouth the Army.

"We ourselves," Lieutenant Colonel V. Volodin writes to the editorial office, "must more boldly reveal and demonstrate our own shortcomings, laying bare their roots. Let society look at the Army as though at a mirror. Let it ponder our flaws: Are they not inborn? Let it reflect on what a difficult contingent [of troops] officers now have to work with. Everything that worries society about army life must be examined from the angle of the country's defense capability, not from any subjective standpoint or from the viewpoint of 'army interests.' The Army embodies the country's most important interest—defense capability."

Many of the officers who have reacted to the article "Is the Artillery Firing on Its Own Men...?" emphasize that the press attention to problems within the Army is in itself a positive phenomenon. But this attention must be competent, considered, honest, and interested. Even the most scathing and painful judgments on the Army are seen as fitting when they are constructive, are not at odds with the truth, and are free from demagoguery.

It is a pity that some writers, including even former front-line soldiers, cannot rise above irritable and snobbish, malicious remarks about "generals' caps," "hammocks at dachas," and so forth. This probably happens because of ignorance of the present life of the Army and its real problems. You can see a parade cap in the street or on television, and it is not difficult to imagine yourself lying in a hammock and looking around. But in order to discern problems, you have to immerse yourself in life.

A fruitful example of such immersion was set by the journalist Anatoliy Salutskiy, who recently published notes in PRAVDA on the social sphere in the Army and Navy.

We know, he writes, that our servicemen have everything necessary today. However, what is chiefly meant by "everything" is weapons and other combat facilities. The social sphere in the Armed Forces has lagged behind in recent years as much as or maybe even more than it has in the country as a whole. The quality of daily life in the Army and Navy is now strikingly at odds with the advanced technology that is in service....

Yet army service, the author stresses, is difficult and harsh. No other form of human activity can compare with it for tension and also danger, even in peacetime. (That is what the military have really "grabbed"!) Think of some exercises! Or even commonplace, "ordinary," so to speak, alert duty shifts, when you have to be ready at a moment's notice to counter not a training enemy but a very real one. Servicemen today more than ever need a reliable rear and constant, not occasional, spiritual support and emotional concern from the whole of society, the whole people.

Concern also presupposes criticism, of course, but businesslike, valid, comradely criticism, not spiteful criticism.

Reservists' Rally Focuses on Patriotic Education

PM160939 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

[Lieutenant Colonel P. Tkachenko article: "Staying a Soldier... Thoughts After the First All-Union Rally of Young Reserve Servicemen in Ashkhabad"]

[Excerpts] Many of them were only recently out of uniform and still felt awkward without it, and their hands remember the warmth and cold and combat weaponry. One can see the military training in the faces of those who have been in the reserve for several years.

These are people who, after being discharged into the reserve, remained true to their army and combat brotherhood. They were brought to Turkmen soil, where the first all-union rally of young reserve servicemen was held on the initiative of the Komsomol Central Committee, with the active participation of the Turkestan Military District Political Directorate. They were motivated by a desire to devote their efforts to the heroic and patriotic education of schoolchildren and youngsters below draft age. Restructuring is needed in this area as well. The need for it has been felt by many people, but it was these people—those who have been through the army and navy school of life and have been tested not only on firing ranges but under real fire on the burning soil of Afghanistan—who tackled the problem.

The rally program included training and methodological exercises in fire and tactical training, and other exercises. But people awaited the start of work in the discussion centers with particular impatience.

So just what were the rally participants arguing about? The fact is that in recent years an interesting and useful patriotic movement of reserve servicemen has been quietly growing in the country. Young people who have been through the army and navy school of life started getting involved in youngsters' heroic and patriotic education, including in clubs and associations. Today we can already talk confidently about this phenomenon not as an initiative by individual enthusiasts but as a patriotic movement. We can only be grateful to the Komsomol Central Committee, which recognized and assessed this movement in good time.

The nature of this movement is understandable. It is thought that it emerged, on the one hand, as a reaction to the fact that in some fields the existing system of patriotic education and predraft training has begun to fail. On the other hand, it was a kind of challenge to pacifist sentiments, which unfortunately have started to frequently manifest themselves under the flag of glasnost. The movement today is a real force. Through its activity, enthusiasm, and eagerness, the movement opposes those informal associations of young people which are springing up on the soil of philosophical incoherence, and ultimately on the soil of ignorance and loutishness.

The main thing that you get out of the discussions is a conviction of the nobility of the patriotic movement's aims. The reserve servicemen are concerned about how to teach young guys a serious attitude to life and how to train them for military service. [passage omitted]

The first all-union rally of reserve servicemen adopted a final document, a kind of appeal to all interested ministries and departments to give assistance to improving the system of military-patriotic education of schoolchildren and predraft young people. The appeal also expresses readiness to devote its energy, experience, and knowledge to this noble work. Whether clubs will or will not exist, and if so what they will be like, will depend on whether the impassioned voice of the reserve servicemen will be heeded. Unfortunately, doubt is already creeping in that the appeal will be not be heeded by all to whom it is addressed.

The rally advocated holding the first all-union rally of leaders of existing military sports associations in 1988 to work out the possible structure of associations under the Komsomol Central Committee and determine the basic directions of the work.

Undoubtedly major and important work has begun. But it has only begun. The enthusiasm and energy of the young reserve servicemen requires immediate translation into good actions. At the same time, one wonders whether the transformations will be viable and how essential they will turn out to be not only today but in the future. An exceptional feature of the present situation is that now many reserve servicemen have served in Afghanistan. But there are also other reserve servicemen who did not fight but who have also passed through the school of army and navy life. Will these forms of heroic and patriotic education also prove acceptable to them? These and other questions persistently face us and require extensive discussion in periodicals so that the rally can be approached with a clear idea about the nature of participation of reserve servicemen in the heroic and patriotic education of young people. [passage omitted]